# DISPERSAL OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

No. 82-1

# HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

OF THE

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

## H. R. 1728

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE A PROGRAM TO PROVIDE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL BUILDINGS OUTSIDE OF, BUT IN THE VICINITY OF AND ACCESSIBLE TO, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

FEBRUARY 5, 6, AND 8, 1951

Printed for the use of the Committee on Public Works

LAW LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.
MAR 8 1951

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
79466 WASHINGTON : 1951

## COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, New York, *Chairman*

HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr., Louisiana
GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland
CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee
JAMES W. TRIMBLE, Arkansas
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota
TOM PICKETT, Texas
ROBERT E. JONES, Jr., Alabama
HENDERSON L. LANHAM, Georgia
ROBERT T. SECREST, Ohio
T. VINCENT QUINN, New York
MORGAN M. MOULDER, Missouri
JOHN J. DEMPSEY, New Mexico
FRANK E. SMITH, Mississippi

GEORGE A. DONDERO, Michigan
HOMER D. ANGELL, Oregon
J. HARRY McGREGOR, Ohio
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey
J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland
RUSSELL V. MACK, Washington
CHARLES W. VURSELL, Illinois
HUBERT B. SCUDDER, California
MYRON V. GEORGE, Kansas
WILLIAM G. BRAY, Indiana
HOWARD H. BAKER, Tennessee
JOHN T. WOOD, Idaho

JOSEPH H. McGANN, Sr., *Chief Clerk*

---

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

JAMES W. TRIMBLE, Arkansas, *Chairman*

CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee
JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota
TOM PICKETT, Texas
HENDERSON L. LANHAM, Georgia
T. VINCENT QUINN, New York
HENRY D. LARCADE, Jr., Louisiana
GEORGE H. FALLON, Maryland

J. HARRY McGREGOR, Ohio
JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey
J. GLENN BEALL, Maryland
HUBERT B. SCUDDER, California
MYRON V. GEORGE, Kansas
WILLIAM G. BRAY, Indiana

# CONTENTS


Statements and testimony: Page

American Institute of Architects 144

Arlington County (Va.) Board, statements before Senate Public Works Committee 89, 91, 129

Brookfield, John W., Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission 135, 137

Cannon, Mrs. Florence, chairman, Arlington (Va.) County Board, statement before Senate Public Works Committee 89, 91, 129

Corbalis, James J., Jr., sanitary engineer, Fairfax County, Va 122

Defense Department, views 32

Eby, Cecil, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission 83

Jones, Roger W., Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget 2

Kanfer, Morris, Washington, D. C 92, 142

Kinnier, C. L., Arlington County Board, Arlington, Va 120

Lee, Blair, Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission 57

Lepley, Matthew, G., architect, Washington, D. C 100

Mulkern, Frank, Izaak Walton League of America 104

Nolen, John, Jr., National Capital Park and Planning Commission 52, 84, 118

Potts, Ramsay D., Jr., National Security Resources Board 21

Purves, Edmund R., American Institute of Architects 144

Reynolds, W. E., Commissioner of Public Buildings 36, 107

Sasscer, Hon. Lansdale G., Member of Congress 141

Schmidt, Maj. Gen. W. R., Department of Defense Joint Decentralization Board 32

Smith, Hon. Howard W., Member of Congress 120, 137

Tuemmler, Fred W., Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission 77, 81

Wiley, Hon, Alexander, United States Senator, letter 143

Bill, dates, reports, etc.:

Agencies, dispersal list 5, 6

Alexandria, Va., survey, dispersal program 127

Amendments, proposed 37, 52, 54, 95

Arlington, Va., Office of County Manager, letter 89

Arlington County, Va., status of existing plans 129

Brookfield, John W., Fairfax, Va., letter to 124

Decentralization, number of agencies being recommended for 118

Decentralization plans 6

Defense, Department of, views, letter 119

Executive agencies to receive first consideration for dispersal, list 5, 6

Fairfax County, Va., survey, planning needs for dispersal program 132

Falls Church, Va., Office of Planning Engineer, planning needs for dispersal program 126

February 5, 1951 1

Afternoon session 29

February 6, 1951 51

Afternoon session 80

February 8, 1951 107

H. R. 1728 1

Lawton, F. J., Director, Bureau of the Budget, report 4

Loudoun County, Va., status of existing plans 128

Lovett, Robert A., Deputy Secretary of Defense, letter 119

Lundberg, A. T., County Manager, Arlington, Va., letter 89

Maryland Commission Act, sections of acts relating to 86–88

Bill, dates, reports, etc.—Continued
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission:
Laws relating to ..... 88
Resolution ..... 63
Relationship to local commissions, laws ..... 84
Report ..... 51
Sections from laws relating thereto ..... 86
Survey, dispersal program, Virginia ..... 125
Survey, dispersal program:
Alexandria, Va ..... 127
Northern Virginia area ..... 125
Survey, planning needs under dispersal program, Fairfax County, Va. 132
Virginia, Northern, Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission, report ..... 135
Woodson, W. T., division superintendent, Fairfax County (Va.) School Board, letter ..... 124

# DISPERSAL OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

**MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1951**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
*Washington, D. C.*

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. James W. Trimble (subcommittee chairman) presiding.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The subcommittee will come to order.

We have met today to continue hearings on the dispersal program.

To begin with, I would like to give to the clerk to be made a part of the record a copy of H. R. 1728, which is an identical bill with H. R. 9864 on which hearings were held in December.

(The bill referred to is as follows:)

[H. R. 1728, 82d Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To authorize a program to provide for the construction of Federal buildings outside of, but in the vicinity of and accessible to, the District of Columbia, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That in furtherance of the policy and intent of the Congress to provide for the continuance at all times of the conduct of the vital business of the Nation and for the sound development of the District of Columbia and its adjacent areas, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to acquire such sites located outside of, but in the vicinity of and accessible to, the District of Columbia as he deems appropriate for the purposes of this Act, and to provide for the construction thereon of buildings for the accommodation of the activities of the Government. Such construction shall extend to and include the acquisition of lands, easements, and rights-of-way by purchase, lease, exchange, donation, or condemnation, and, prior to the approval of title thereto by the Attorney General, the construction thereon and equipping by contract or otherwise of buildings and all things accessory and appurtenant thereto and comprising components of respective projects, and, in addition, the provision of such utilities, roads, highways, bridges, communications, and other off-site facilities as may be necessary and appropriate: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services may enter into contracts with States and local bodies for such purposes and to such extent as he may find to be in the public interest: *And provided further*, That the Administrator of General Services may act through the Commissioner of Public Roads and utilize the services and facilities of the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, in connection with the construction of roads, highways, and appurtenant facilities, and for that purpose may transfer funds made available pursuant to this Act, in reimbursement or otherwise, to said Bureau.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of General Services shall assign and reassign space to executive agencies in the buildings provided by this Act or in any other Government-owned or leased buildings in or outside of the District of Columbia under the authority and subject to the conditions and limitations of section 210 (e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, providing for the assignment and reassignment of space to all executive agencies without regard to any other laws relating to physical location either (a) of such agencies or (b) of performance of their functions.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of General Services $190,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act. Appropriations provided under this authority shall, when so specified therein, remain available until expended.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The subcommittee has before it copies of the hearings that were held in December, and we will use those. Today we want to hear the witnesses who testified at that time to see if there is any change or revision that they wish to make in their testimony.

First, I would like to call Mr. Roger W. Jones, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Now, Mr. Jones, this subcommittee, of course, is sitting more or less as a jury to report to the full committee. Those members who were not present at the former hearing will be able to read the hearings that we held before. We want from you now any additional testimony that you may have, or to hear any change in the testimony that was given in December.

## STATEMENT OF ROGER W. JONES, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, IN CHARGE OF LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE

Mr. JONES. My name is Roger W. Jones, and I am Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget in charge of legislative reference.

Mr. Chairman, since our last appearance before you in December several things have happened. I believe in the main only one of them is a matter in which the Bureau of the Budget should be responsible for the testimony before your committee.

I am, of course, ready to answer whatever questions the members of the committee may have that I am in a position to answer, and then I will refer to my colleagues from the other agencies such other questions as there may be.

The chief development in this proposed program of dispersal and decentralization, since we appeared before your committee last, has been an increase in the number of positions to be decentralized permanently to locations around the country.

That in turn has been responsible for a proposal to reduce the number of dispersal sites in the Washington area.

The Commissioner of Public Buildings will take up that side of the proposal, and if I may, sir, I will defer any further reference to that until Mr. Reynolds comes on.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is there any additional legislation required to decentralize departments that are within the area of Washington? Suppose you wanted to take some of the departments all the way to the Midwest or the far West, does someone have the authority to do that without further legislation?

Mr. JONES. I believe that could be done simply by the provision of funds. In some few cases we might have the problem of authorization because of the fact that in the past the Congress has created some of the departments, and I believe that a few of the agencies with a specific stipulation in the enacting clause, "There is hereby created at the seat of government * * *"

The attorneys are not entirely in agreement as to what the effect of that language is, but it is my belief that we ought to take it literally. The seat of Government is the District of Columbia and its immediate environs, and where we are faced with that kind of lan-

guage, if we propose to move an agency in all of its parts, we believe that we should have additional authority. That is one of the reasons why this additional authority has been written into the bill which is before you.

Mr. McGregor. If I may inquire further, then you believe, Mr. Jones, the bureau heads have the authority to decentralize into the Midwest or the South, and because of the fact that additional money would be required to obtain space and for the moving of the department, you would suggest additional legislation covering that particular department be passed by the Congress?

Mr. Jones. It has always been my feeling when you embark upon a program you should not have to piece together authorities that appear to be implicit, or which may exist in several other places. By and large, we should come to the Congress and ask the Congress for the authority that is clear, unequivocal; authority that people can understand, so that afterward they can understand under what authority you did act.

There may be other times in the years to come when it will be advantageous, or perhaps necessary, to consider moving an agency from this immediate vicinity to another location in the country; therefore, I think that it would not only be helpful but proper to have on the statute books continuing authority for the General Services Administration to make that kind of transfer.

Mr. McGregor. May I inquire, would you suggest that enabling legislation specifically set forth certain departments? I am speaking for myself now. I no longer am going to get into the position of allowing the departments here in Washington to move a department to the far West, or to the South, and then find ourselves needing to put up several hundred thousands, or even millions, for the facilities to take care of the departments where in other sections of the country we have those facilities available. Do you think in order for me to attain my point which I think will save money we should pass legislation giving specific authority?

Mr. Jones. If I understand you, you are really raising two questions. The first is, Should the agency be specified? and, second, Should the locations to which they are to go be specified?

Mr. McGregor. Yes.

Mr. Jones. I do not know whether my opinion is worth much, but I will give it to you for what it is worth.

Mr. McGregor. I would like to have it.

Mr. Jones. I feel a listing of the locations to which agencies should go would probably turn out to be something we would all regret. This program, for reasons I am sure the committee will understand, is in a rather constant state of flux and will remain so for quite some time. Therefore, if the Congress should, in advance of a firm determination on what was going and how many positions it involved—attempt to spell out general guide lines, either by exclusion of certain locations or by a list of other locations, I think we would find ourselves in a very inflexible position. It would probably cause us a lot of trouble.

By the same token, the designation of what agencies are to go, I think would become very rapidly a millstone. You would be freezing, in a location, a function of Government which in the course of the general operations you might want to change over the years.

If I may illustrate: During the last war we established the Office of Dependency Benefits of the Army in Newark. As the war came to a close and as the size of the job came down, it was possible to shift it to the Army Records Center in St. Louis.

We have assured the committee it is our hope in the executive branch that the decentralizations made at this time can be made permanent. That does not mean, however, necessarily, that the agencies which move out, or the functions which move out, will, for all time, continue to operate at the first place to which they are sent. There are a good many reasons why I believe that should be flexible.

First of all, as we have indicated to the committee, we do not feel we should move agencies or parts of them into other critical target areas. There are other cities which are targets just as important as Washington.

Incidentally, as I am sure Mr. Reynolds will bring out, we may find that the situation on space in some cities is such that you have to make a general area for allocation at this time rather than a specific pin point.

Finally, I believe if the legislation says that you shall take the Office of Historical Records, we will say, of the Department of the Navy and move it to Toledo, Ohio, then you have a rigid statutory requirement that the Office of Naval Records may be maintained in Toledo.

I, perhaps, have given an overelaborate answer.

Mr. McGregor. I appreciate your knowledge of the subject.

Mr. Trimble. You may proceed with your general statement.

Mr. Jones. The other new factor which has come into the picture since our last hearing, Mr. Chairman, has been the completion of a list, by agencies and by total number of employees, who would be sent to the dispersed areas if this legislation becomes law.

Mr. Trimble. And the list you have prepared is a tentative list of the proposed six sites?

Mr. Jones. Yes. That list was incorporated in a letter signed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Lawton, on January 29, and addressed to Mr. Buckley as chairman of the full committee.

Mr. Trimble. I have not seen it.

Mr. Jones. May I ask that it be put into the record of these hearings?

Mr. Trimble. How long is it?

Mr. Jones. It is a page and a quarter letter, followed by a three-page list of agencies and functions.

Mr. Trimble. Let the list be inserted in the record at this point along with the letter.

(The letter and list referred to are as follows:)

Executive Office of the President,
Bureau of the Budget,
*Washington, D. C., January 29, 1951.*

Hon. Charles A. Buckley,
*Chairman, House Committee on Public Works,*
*House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

My Dear Mr. Buckley: In compliance with the request in your letter of January 22, I submit the following comment regarding H. R. 1728, a bill to authorize a program to provide for the construction of Federal buildings outside of, but in the vicinity of, and accessible to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

At your committee hearing on December 8, 1950, a program was submitted which contemplated the acquisition of eight dispersed sites, each of sufficient size to accommodate Federal office buildings with a capacity of 10,000 employees. It was proposed that on each site there be constructed a permanent-type office building with a capacity for approximately 5,000 employees—a total of 40,000 for all sites. Expansion needs in excess of that total were to be met by the construction of additional buildings which the Congress might from time to time authorize.

On December 16, 1950, a national emergency was declared, with a resulting emphatic acceleration in defense mobilization. Even with the execution of a substantial decentralization plan, present defense mobilization and control programs will require, by January 1952, new buildings with at least a 40,000 personnel capacity if, in the interest of security, the hazardous temporary wooden buildings in the Washington central area are to be vacated within the next 18 months. Full mobilization would greatly increase requirements.

Our present plans contemplate the permanent removal from the Washington area of about 25,000 positions, which is an increase of 17,000 over the estimated number to be decentralized as given to your committee last December. This will necessitate some adjustments in the construction program for the Washington dispersal area. Representatives of the General Services Administration will explain these adjustments to your subcommittee in the next few days.

At a hearing before a Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, I was asked to submit a list of agencies which are proposed for dispersal under present defense mobilization plans. A copy of this list is attached for your information.

In his letter of December 5, 1950, to Mr. Whittington, the President urged that the Congress provide the necessary authority to disperse and decentralize Government functions. In his recent budget message he repeated this request. It is now recommended that the requisite authority be provided in time to permit the completion of some of the dispersed buildings by next January.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON, *Director.*

*Executive agencies, or parts thereof, which will receive first consideration for location in buildings with a 40,000 personnel capacity to be constructed in Washington dispersal areas*

| | |
|---|---|
| Atomic Energy Commission: Entire headquarters office which administers the atomic energy program. Number of positions involved | 1,000 |
| Department of Commerce, Coast and Geodetic Survey: This agency produces essential maps and charts | 1,000 |
| Defense Production Administration, National Production Authority: Present plans envision the dispersal of up to 75 per cent of the activities of these offices. The location pattern would provide for central policy and programing functions and those of the industry divisions to be performed in central Washington. The processing operations related to controlled materials and allocation programs and a part of the defense production staff would be considered for dispersal. However, until these offices become fully organized and acquire the experience necessary to make the practical separation of operations, it is believed that the estimate for dispersed positions should be reduced to 50 percent of their expected strength by June 1952. Number of positions involved | 3,500 |
| Economic Stabilization Agency: This Agency is expected to have about 3,500 employees in the Washington area by June 1952. Present plans provide for the Economic Stabilizer and his staff to be centrally located and the price and wage control operations to be conducted at a dispersed location. Under this pattern about 3,000 positions would be involved | 3,000 |
| Federal Civil Defense Administration: This Administration provides central planning and coordination of the civilian defense efforts of the Nation. In an emergency the Administrator, at the direction of the President, is authorized to coordinate and direct relief activities of the departments and agencies (after due consideration of military requirements of the Department of Defense) of the Federal Government. At present time organization and program plans are not sufficiently firm to estimate accurately the number of employees required for the headquarters staff. It is believed however provision should be made for at least | 600 |

*Executive agencies, or parts thereof, which will receive first consideration for location in buildings with a 40,000 personnel capacity to be constructed in Washington dispersal areas*—Continued

| | |
|---|---|
| Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines: The Fuels and Explosives and the Foreign Minerals Divisions. These are technical divisions which provide basic data for defense activities | 300 |
| Geological Survey: The Water Resources, Topographic, Geologic, and Conservation Divisions. These are technical and operating Divisions essential to defense activities | 1,400 |
| Department of State: About 50 percent of the authorized positions of the Department in Washington. Includes functions of high priority such as the geographic bureaus and intelligence divisions. Activities of the Department now conducted in 24 buildings, some of which are of temporary construction. Estimated number of positions involved | 3,500 |
| Treasury Department, Bureau of Public Debt: Those parts of the Divisions of (*a*) Loans and Currency and (*b*) Public Debt Accounts and Audit, which maintain the basic records incident to the receipt, custody, and issuance of new securities, the transactions in outstanding debt, and administrative control accounts over all security transactions | 1,000 |

---

ACTIVITIES OR MAJOR PORTIONS THEREOF BEING CONSIDERED FOR LOCATION IN THE DISPERSAL AREA IN THE EVENT CONGRESS AUTHORIZES PROGRAM

(List furnished by the Deputy Secretary of Defense with his letter of January 26, 1951, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget)

Department of the Army:
- Office, Chief of Chaplains
- Office, Chief of Military History
- Office of the Judge Advocate General
- National Guard Bureau
- Chief of Finance
- Office of the Inspector General
- Office of the Provost Marshal General
- Office of the Surgeon General
- Office, Chief of Ordnance
- Office, Chief of Engineers
- Office, Chief of Transportation Corps
- Office, Chief Signal Officer
- Office, Chief of Chemical Corps
- Office of Adjutant General
- Office of the Quartermaster General
- Other activities of equal or more importance

Department of the Navy:
- Office of Naval Research
- Bureau of Medicine and Surgery
- Bureau of Ordnance

Department of the Navy—Continued
- Bureau of Aeronautics
- Bureau of Yards and Docks
- Bureau of Supply and Accounts
- Bureau of Ships
- Bureau of Naval Personnel
- Headquarters, Marine Corps
- Military Sea Transport Service
- Other activities of equal or more importance

Department of the Air Force:
- Director of Air Provost Marshal
- Director of Special Investigation
- Director of Procurement Inspection
- Postal Division, Air Adjutant General
- Operation Activities, Director of the Budget
- Director of Civilian Personnel
- Director of Installations
- Director of Maintenance of Supply and Services
- Military Air Transport Service
- Other activities of equal or more importance

Mr. JONES. Just to summarize the letter, it was in response to the committee's request for a list, and it indicates that on each site there would be constructed a permanent type office building with a capacity of 5,000 employees for a total of 40,000. We then go to say:

> Our present plans contemplate permanent decentralization from the Washington area of about 25,000 positions, which is an increase of 17,000 over the estimated number to be decentralized as given to your committee last December.

We then go on to list the executive agencies, or parts thereof, which will receive first consideration for location and buildings, with a 40,000 personnel capacity, to be constructed in the Washington dispersal area.

First is the Atomic Energy Commission, the headquarters office, with 1,000 positions.

Next is the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Department of Commerce, also with 1,000 positions. That agency, as you know, is one of our most important mapping agencies.

Next are the new emergency agencies. There is the Defense Production Administration and some of its constituent parts, the National Production Authority, with 3,500 positions.

Then there is the Economic Stabilization Agency, with 3,000.

Next is the Civil Defense Administration with 600.

Next is a part of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior, 300, and the divisions of the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior having to do with water resources, topographic, geological, and conservation matters, 1,400.

Then about 50 percent of the authorized positions of the Department of State in Washington, which would total about 3,500.

There would be parts of the Bureau of Public Debt of the Treasury Department, the Loans and Currency Division, and the Public Debt Accounts and Audit, 1,000.

Then, selected from the three military services, we have listed offices just as they were supplied to us by the Department of Defense. There are a number of functions and activities of those three departments which I will not attempt to assess at this time, nor the total number of positions that would be involved. That list is fairly long, sir. It will be in the record.

I will just indicate the kinds of things—the National Guard Bureau, the Chief of Finance, the Office of the Inspector General, the Office of the Provost Marshal General, and functions of that kind for the Army.

For the Navy, the Office of Naval Research, the Bureau of Ordnance, the Bureau of Aeronautics, the Bureau of Yards and Docks.

And there would be approximately the same kind of functions for the Air Force—the Air Provost Marshal, their special investigation division, the Director of Maintenance of Supply and Services, and so forth.

The Department of Defense felt on January 26, when this list was supplied to us, that it would be unwise to choose forthwith and finally the agencies to go because that Department is in a constant state of shaking down and organizing itself for the work that lies ahead of it in the course of the next few years. The list of constituent parts of those departments to go could be made fixed, I think, very quickly, as soon as we know what kind of an authorization the Congress enacts and as soon as we know where the sites are to be selected.

Thereafter, it will be just a matter of getting the buildings completed, and certainly long before the buildings are completed the functions to go to them will be notified.

I think that there is very little more for me to add this morning, Mr. Chairman, except to answer such questions as the committee may have.

There is one thing that I would like to mention. There has been, I think, some honest doubt in the minds of the committee and in the minds of other Members of Congress, both in the House and Senate, as to whether we really need to go as far as 20 miles in choosing these dispersal sites. We felt we presented evidence to the committee of

the considerations which underlay the selection of roughly the 20-mile circle as the approximate distance to which we should go. We feel that the kind of thinking which underlay those proposals has been more than borne out by the news in the last few days and the pictures that have been in the paper of the effect of some of the atomic explosions in the new proving ground. If it becomes possible to break a plate glass window almost 100 miles away from the testing center, we feel that a 20-mile circle will give a degree of protection we cannot get closer in. It will also very largely allay the fears of many people that if we do not go that far out there is the possibility of blast damage, or at least of blast panic, shall we say—people being afraid that they have not been given the maximum protection which dispersal will permit.

We do not feel that we should go much beyond the 20-mile circle for reasons which we have discussed with the committee before, namely, the great added cost that would come about for roads, communications, and things of that kind, and also because we feel that you would lose all the advantages of central control which you could maintain fairly effectively within the 20-mile limit.

That, Mr. Chairman, is about all that is new that falls within our sphere at the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you, Mr. Jones.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Jones, I do not want to get off the track, but if we can spare these agencies to go out 20 miles, have you given any thought to sending them out 700 or 1,000 miles? It seems to me that the planners today are trying to get away from further congesting the metropolitan cities and areas. Mr. Fallon the other day suggested to me while we were sitting here that in the next decade it could very well be that there would be absolutely no break between Washington and Baltimore; that it would be so surely and completely built up that you would never know when you left Washington and entered Baltimore.

Now, from the standpoint of traffic congestion we all know that you can put just so many automobiles in a given space within a given time, and there will be an increase with more motor vehicles and the congestion will be terrific that will come from the traffic.

Then you have the health and the sewage-disposal problems, and the water supply. We know that all over our country we are using up our water supply. Have you thought about the wisdom of putting them farther out than 20 miles from Washington—say 800 or 1,000 miles away, buildings to take care of a great many of these agencies, and keep them there for all time? There you could build the necessary villages and the commercial centers to supply them, and there you could take care of the health and recreation of the children of those working in these Government agencies. You would not have this terrific congestion. For the long-time pull have you given any thought to sending them out permanently rather than just for this period?

Mr. JONES. We have given a great deal of thought to it, Congressman Davis. I think permanent decentralization of functions from Washington, over and above the 25,000 positions which we now believe we can send out safely without any loss of central direction and control, presents really two alternatives: On the one hand, we have to assess the desirability of maintaining Washington and its environs as

the nerve center of our Government, as the seat of government, with the existence here of as many of the departments and agencies as are required to give the best degree of continuity of function, and as are required, frankly, because the Congress itself wants to have the agencies accessible.

If you go to another form of organization for the Federal Government, I cannot in good conscience say that it would be impossible to decentralize permanently far more than 25,000 positions on top of what we already have in the field. But in giving that consideration may I point out one or two things that I believe are really of very great importance—first of all, there are already away from Washington permanently just about 90 percent of all the Federal employees, and all Federal positions. Now, what is here looks big and will look bigger, of course, if we go into a full-scale mobilization. But I think that it is very hard to say that keeping less than 10 percent of your employees at the seat of government will represent a figure which makes available to the Chief Executive and to the Congress all of the functions—the planning functions, the administrative and supervisory functions, the program functions—which are necessary to insure a cohesive Federal establishment.

There are many difficulties. We have overlaps in jurisdiction which are matter of statute, matters of good organization. Sometimes they are matters of accident. Where you have such overlaps, it seems to us, from having studied it very intensively over the last 15 or 20 years in the Bureau of the Budget, that you have to keep in reasonably close relationship, one to the other, the central directing portions of those functions.

That does not mean that when we are in a position to come to you with a list of the functions we propose to decentralize it would not be possible to choose others, or that it would not be possible to expand the list. I think that you could always say, "Yes." You could get to the point where Washington became almost nothing except the Federal triangle buildings—and possible the Pentagon, the Chief Executive, the Congress, and the Judiciary, with a very, very small nucleus of top personnel here far removed from their operating agencies. If that came about, we would have to think in terms of the creation of an entirely different method of management for the Government. We would have to have a far different type of communication system. We would have to have a great deal of lost time in getting people into face-to-face contact. Perhaps it is ridiculous to assume that any part of the Executive Office of the President should be decentralized and sent away. It could be done, but I am sure, for example, that the Appropriations Committees would be unhappy if the Budget Bureau went west of the Mississippi River. I think that they would feel they could not operate with us on a day-to-day basis at that distance.

On the other hand, most of the functions of the Department of Interior could be put in the interior, but if you do so, sir, you would have to give consideration to what that would do to relationships and a method of operation which has grown up, been tested and tried over the years, and which has been found to be effective.

Mr. DAVIS. I recognize the truth of your statement, but at the same time I have found that you really do most of your business with the top people. Many of these agencies that you have described as going out could work anywhere.

I have been thinking about communications, the lost time, and so forth. Of course, winter is not a long period in the seasons, but we have experienced a very severe winter recently. Think of the absenteeism you would find if they were dispersed 20 miles away; when you would have 25,000 or 40,000 people having to go 20 miles out and 20 miles back. Just the other day some of us had to abandon our cars 6 miles from the Capitol because we could not get home. I think that is something to consider. When a man has to drive 20 miles out and 20 miles back, that is 40 miles, and the planners tell us today that we do not want to use up too much of a man's energy going to and from his place of work. It saps his vitality, and with the heavy traffic and the movement of people 20 miles away, when he got to his job he would feel that he had done a pretty good day's work.

I do know that the planners are trying to get away from these centers. They are telling industry to go out. The Federal Government is the biggest business of all businesses today.

Now, I see that we are talking about six buildings. It might be well to put one out here and another one 20 miles away, but the other four buildings might be able to go. I am thinking about getting way out and starting a new Federal community where people could live happily. If, by some miracle, peace should come to the world, what are we going to do with these six buildings?

Mr. JONES. They will be permanent Federal sites, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. That is my point. You are going to keep the people in these buildings once you get them out there.

Mr. JONES. Absolutely.

Mr. DAVIS. Why not go for the long-range pull, because Washington is overcrowded now. We are so short of space now that Mr. Reynolds is trying his best to find spots just to put a desk. Why not for the long-range pull go way out and build some of these buildings and keep from getting Washington into a horribly congested city? That is what I am thinking about. That is more of an observation than a question.

Mr. SCUDDER. My question is whether or not you are planning to move our entire department with their original records, or whether you are going to set up duplicate records of the various departments that are decentralized? Is that the plan, to have duplicate records; records for the working force out in the area and the same records here in Washington for immediate use, or is it your intention to be able to communicate between Washington and agencies located a distance of 20 miles?

Mr. JONES. Both elements are in the picture, Mr. Scudder. In some instances we would take an entire organization, as, for example, the Coast and Geodetic Survey In other cases we would take only part of the organization.

Where you have an agency which must, perforce, depend very largely upon its records, we are hoping that as time goes on it will become possible to have duplicate sets of the most essential of those records. the whole concept of this dispersal idea centers around three assumptions: First, that Washington will remain the seat of government. Second, that since it is the seat of government, you must have within easy distance of each other the agencies which are necessary to maintain continuity of government, either for a mobilization or war effort, or for a peacetime continuing organization. And third,

that dispersal of parts of agencies can be accomplished without loss of direction and control. Some of the staff agencies, as, for example, the agencies that make up the Executive Office of the President, the Council of Economic Advisers, the Bureau of the Budget, the National Security Resources Board, and so forth, whose total personnel is small would not be dispersed. Since they perform a staff function they have to be quickly available, to be able to get program information quickly and, to analyze that program information for whatever assignments the Chief Executive calls upon them to perform. Much the same kind of relationship exists between them and the Congress.

In other cases, the larger departments and agencies, which are a grouping of functions that may be largely independent one of the other but which have enough general relationship to a broad field so that central direction and control of those agencies is necessary, can be partly dispersed. Personnel all working on facets of the same set of programs or problems are best grouped together.

The Department of the Interior is a case in point. I think we would all agree that it makes sense to keep the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines in the same departmental structure. And certainly it makes sense to have the Bureau of the Public Debt, the Disbursing Office, Customs, Internal Revenue and the Secret Service, all with complementary statutory responsibilities, in the Treasury Department. But parts of them can be dispersed and are safer if dispersed. Other parts might be permanently decentralized.

However, when you get into the field, say, of the regulatory commissions, it would be, in my judgment, next to impossible for the regulatory commissions to operate on a common basis of understanding each of the other's problems, and with the vast number of issues which come in interplay among two or more of them, if they were widely separated. If the members and staffs of the commissions were not able to be in close day-to-day contact, you would have a problem.

The extent to which Federal Government programs and Federal Government responsibilities interlock is something which I do not believe any of us really understand. You cannot separate the operations of the Federal Trade Commission from the operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, or from the operations of the Food and Drug Administration. In order to have any kind of cohesive program at all, they have to be where they can be in close day-to-day contact.

Mr. SCUDDER. I am interested in the statement that Mr. Davis brought up regarding the congestion that is brought about by large numbers of employees moving between two points. Before coming to Congress I served on the Public Works Board of the State of California. We decentralized all of our institutions, such as penitentiaries, and so forth. We went into the country to find adequate locations, where there was a water supply, where the soil was good, where housing was available. We selected sites that would be rather self-contained and able to rely upon their own requirements in the area.

I do not know what the set-up is here. I do not know what care has been given to the selection of sites. It would seem to me that any site selected for the employment of four or five thousand people should be one in which they could be rather self-contained, so that they could eliminate the transportation difficulties that exist in a

congested area like Washington. Living conditions, in other words, would be much better elsewhere than in a large metropolitan center.

Who has charge of the selection of these sites? I see that there is an Administrator of General Services and that an authority is to be set up. Do they have engineers who make surveys to determine the type of areas to be selected for such a purpose?

Mr. JONES. Yes; Mr. Reynolds, who is the Commissioner of Public Buildings, will go into that more thoroughly, Mr. Scudder. But may I say this: Perhaps we have been wrong in our conclusions and in our thinking. But certainly we have arrived at our conclusions by the honest process of very careful examination. We have felt from the very first receipt of this assignment from the National Security Resources Board in the fall of 1948 that one of the things which we wanted to avoid and which should be avoided was the creation of entirely self-contained little Districts of Columbia anywhere within easy striking distance of Washington.

We felt that it would be wrong to create, in effect, a new series of satellite Federal Districts. We have felt that if the area for the construction of the Federal office buildings in these dispersed sites was kept to the minimum, two or three hundred acres, and the basic responsibility of the Federal Government went only to the construction of the building and its supporting facilities like cafeterias and sewerage systems, and on as permanent a basis as we could get it, the assignment of functions which would operate from each location, that the other problems of community facilities and housing very largely would take care of themselves over a period of time.

Individuals, of course, will gravitate to within a reasonable distance of the place where they work. I am sure that today we have a very substantial proportion of our Federal employees in Washington already commuting from distances which are greater than they would have to go to get to one of these new buildings after a general shift in living arrangements takes place.

If, for example, we picked a site somewhere down off the Shirley Highway in Virginia, 15 or 20 miles down, and that were assigned to functions of the Department of Defense, inevitably, over the course of years, there will be built or bought around that center and in the towns which are most closely adjacent to it, the homes of a large proportion of the Federal employees.

That kind of thing happens even when Federal office buildings are located on the fringes of Washington, as we now know it. Suitland was developed just prior to the last war, and a very substantial number of the permanent employees of the Bureau of the Census now live generally in the Suitland area.

Similarly, a very substantial proportion of the employees of the Public Health Service and of the National Institutes of Health are gravitating toward the Bethesda, Chevy Chase, Rockville, Gaithersburg, Potomac areas.

We anticipate that that will happen again. But we did not feel that it was wise, under a program of this kind, to build what I think in my earlier testimony I referred to as "little Oak Ridges." We do not think that these should be Federal communities in which the Federal Government does everything—builds the schools, builds the houses, builds the churches—that it should be a great big reservation that has been carved out as another Federal District in an adjoining State.

Mr. SCUDDER. That was not what I was referring to. I am opposed to the Government's going into the business of building houses or of building anything else except that which is essential for Government use. But I do feel that in these areas—in our experience we found that in an institution that will take care of from 2,500 to 3,000 inmates and will employ about 600 civilians the people employed invariably will build their own homes in communities that are near their job. They can live cheaper, in a better environment, away from the congested areas. And it is a normal thing for them to be close to their work.

I think that in the establishment of any of these projects it is well to keep the Government out of the business of building other than the Government building, and then allow somebody to subdivide an area around that region, where housing can be put up for the use of the employees. That will do away with your problem of transportation. I think any plan that is developed for a unit of that sort should take into consideration the necessity of adequate water supply, sewage disposal, and so forth; so that we will have a community that will be able to supply whatever is needed for the operation of a unit of that type. Then, through an interchange of duplicating records of the organization, it would be a unit which could be operated to the benefit of the Government.

Mr. JONES. That has been done, Congressman, to the extent that you could do it without revealing, in advance of the time when it should be revealed, the actual sites selected.

This entire area, which is on the map here, with the concentric circles, has been very carefully examined as to the road net; what we would have to do with the road net, what we would have to do about communications; what the problems are going to be of public transportation; what the problems are going to be of water supply; what will be the availability of land or communities in which people can build houses or in which they can get houses. But we do not feel that we are in a position yet to go on record with respect to these sites. If we start indicating sites in advance of the time when we are certain both of the authorization and of the dimensions of the program, land profiteering will occur. There will be efforts to buy up tracts of land, to jack up prices, and there will be created a whole lot of other artificial difficulties.

Because of the substantial dimensions of this program there will be created problems of a community kind which will have to be handled. But I do not believe that any one of these centers will be so big or will attract to it so large a number of new housing units that the planning and engineering work that has been done on both a theoretical and a practical basis is at fault. I think we know what the problems of water and sewer and schools and churches and recreation are apt to be, and we have a pretty good idea how they can be met. A great deal of work has been done. I have been wordy, but this is a very, very difficult subject.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Jones, this matter has been in the lap of the agencies involved for some 2 years and a few months, as I understand it?

Mr. JONES. That is correct, sir.

Mr. PICKETT. The President made a request last August, I believe, for expeditious consideration and the arrival at some answer to the problem; is not that right?

Mr. JONES. That is right.

Mr. PICKETT. Then we held our hearings in December. I believe—December 8 was the day of the formal hearings, when you and other witnesses testified. At that time I remember the emphasis on the necessity for this dispersal program was, as you stated a few minutes ago, in effect, to permit the continuity of the Government to carry on its essential functions in the event that we should, in this area, be the victim of some aerial or other assault that destroyed buildings and personnel. That was the emphasis in that hearing; was it not?

Mr. JONES. That is correct, sir.

Mr. PICKETT. In a subsequent discussion before the committee, as I remember it, the statement was made that the principal emphasis was upon the need for additional space. I do not recall whether you were present at the time that statement was made. But there would seem to be an apparent conflict within a period of less than 30 days, on what the major emphasis was. I would like to ask you what is the major emphasis today: the need for continuity of the government for national defense or the need for space?

Mr. JONES. I do not believe, Congressman, that there is any conflict or that there was at that time. Referring back to my own statement——

Mr. PICKETT. May I interrupt for just a minute? Perhaps I used the wrong word. Perhaps I should have said the main reason for the change, whether it was a change in emphasis or not?

Mr. JONES. I do not think that actually it has changed. It is just a different facet of thinking that has come in the more prominent discussion in the intervening weeks since we met with you last.

The problem of maintenance of continuity of government, under the assumption that Washington will remain the seat of government, was the primary reason for going into this program, particularly when it appeared that international relations were deteriorating to the point where all of us must certainly look to the possibility, if not the probability, that we might once again be at war.

There was always in this picture the realization that the growth of Washington had reached the point where problems were very, very acute, for two reasons: First, because of an overconcentration in downtown Washington, as a result of the continued occupancy of some very bad temporary buildings which we should tear down; and, second, because of the fact that over the years the Congress has authorized more and more ramified Federal problems which inevitably has meant that there would be more and more demand for offices for employees centrally located in Washington.

We do need space, safe space in case of attack. We need it very badly and we need it right now, because of the fact that we are in this emergency and are now building the counterparts of World War II organizations to handle control programs of one kind or another. But there has never been away from the top of our minds the very real necessity of thinking and planning in terms of the orderly development of the whole metropolitan area and of getting some of this congestion out of downtown Washington.

Mr. PICKETT. As of today, which is the more important of the two considerations, in your opinion, continuity of government or the need for space?

Mr. JONES. I think without any question the need to establish a physical plant, so to speak, in the area of Washington, which will insure continuity of functions in the event of war, is more important than mere space and the difficult day-to-day problems. Traffic jams, or the fact that you are working in an office where you cannot smoke, or where you cannot keep warm in the winter, or where you cannot keep cool in the summer, are of no consequence.

Mr. PICKETT. You are still proposing to tear down these so-called temporary buildings in Washington, even after you have accomplished the dispersal that this program now calls for?

Mr. JONES. Yes, sir.

Mr. PICKETT. Do you not still at this time call for the construction of temporary structures adjacent to and to be used in conjunction with the permanent ones that you want to put on these six locations, if you tear down the existing temporary ones?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Reynolds has some figures on the whole build-up which I think he plans to present. Could we leave that until Mr. Reynolds makes his statement?

Mr. PICKETT. Yes; I should be glad to defer that until that time. At the present time you propose six permanent dispersal areas?

Mr. JONES. That is right.

Mr. PICKETT. In December you proposed eight?

Mr. JONES. That is correct.

Mr. PICKETT. What happened to the other two?

Mr. JONES. The first thing that happened to them was that we were able to increase very substantially the number of positions which we expect to be able permanently to decentralize from Washington.

The other thing which happened was that as the control programs got under way and we were able to examine the prospects for them and the need for their staffing, and so forth, a little more carefully, we came to the conclusion that there had been some overestimating of our immediate space needs for the emergency agency programs. It was not very large, but it was enough so that the two factors, taken together, led us to believe that at this time we should ask for only six sites. I myself am not saying that we could not use eight. I think we could.

Mr. PICKETT. You say at this time you are asking for only six. Am I to draw the inference from that you might come in some time in the immediate future and ask for more?

Mr. JONES. I would say only if we went to war. If we went to war we should certainly have to ask the Congress for authorization to do what we discussed with you earlier, construct semipermanent buildings—that is, poured concrete shell type of buildings on the same locations which are being contemplated for permanent use. Presumably, they would be used for other related functions of the Government after the war.

Every war, for example, creates a terrific mass of records which have to be kept for a certain length of time until you can go through them and straighten them out. They could be used for record purposes, historical purposes, warehouses, and things of that kind.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Jones, in the space of a little over a month, you have changed your thinking on decentralization, dispersal, and the number of people involved in this matter to the point where you have

been able to reduce the requirement for dispersal areas from eight to six. I am wondering if a little further consideration would not lead you to the conclusion that you could cut the number some more?

Mr. JONES. I do not think so, for this reason: I think we are now down to a very definite minimum program, if we think only in terms of a minimum estimate of what the control agencies will need, if we think only in terms of getting the population out of the highly dangerous and highly unsatisfactory wooden temporary buildings.

Mr. PICKETT. In this program of six sites, how many people are you going to move?

Mr. JONES. The sites are still contemplated to have a permanent building on them with a capacity of roughly 5,000 each.

Mr. PICKETT. Then you would move 30,000 people under this program as opposed to approximately 40,000 under the eight-area program?

Mr. JONES. That is, on the permanent basis.

Mr. PICKETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. JONES. Above and beyond that, it is entirely in the lap of the gods what we run into by way of further demands.

Mr. PICKETT. Under the permanent type of construction that you now propose you would move about 5,000 to each of these sites, or 30,000. Do you presently contemplate in your planning the construction of any temporary structures to go along with the permanent types to take care of any more?

Mr. JONES. May I again turn to Mr. Reynolds and ask whether he is not going to go into that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Rather fully, I think.

Mr. JONES. May we defer that until Mr. Reynolds testifies?

Mr. PICKETT. Yes, sir; you certainly may. That is all, thank you.

Mr. GEORGE. The primary purpose of this is dispersal for protection or decentralization to take care of traffic congestion?

Mr. JONES. The primary purpose is protection—to reduce the attractiveness of Washington as a target against which our potential enemies might strike.

Mr. GEORGE. Then are you sure you are going out far enough to obtain safety?

Mr. JONES. We are as sure as human judgment can be sure, Mr. George. Human judgment is not infallible. But on the basis of the material that has been presented to us, with respect to new types of weapons growing out of the atomic bomb, we believe that we have a reasonable and satisfactory margin of safety by going out 20 miles; yes, sir.

Mr. GEORGE. That was the main question I was interested in. If the dispersal were in the interest of the Government protecting records, and so on, then I think all you are doing is enlarging the target area of Washington. I am afraid that that is all you are doing.

Mr. JONES. Colonel Potts of the National Securities Resources Board will have more to say about that when he comes on the stand.

Mr. GEORGE. Of course, I come from a part of the United States where we are not interested in any bureaus—that is, Kansas. I am just wondering if we are accomplishing the purposes of securing safety in following this plan. I think if we finally stumble into another war that all of you will wish that you were in the Rocky Mountains before it is over.

Mr. JONES. Of course, there is always a calculated risk that any war brings. I feel, myself, with great conviction that we must assume the calculated risk of continuing Washington as the seat of our Government, because of what it stands for as a symbol to the entire world. Also, I do not believe you can run a federal government effectively in war or peace on a completely decentralized basis.

Mr. GEORGE. I will admit that a centralized government, where you can reach out and immediately be in touch with anyone you may want to contact, is desirable. But I think that if we get it congested too much, there is the entire possibility that we might wind up without any records or anything else. I know that the human element should be considered in this; by which I mean schools, things of that kind, because I have run up against similar problems in my own personal life, and I think everyone in Washington has run into that, that is, schools and housing. It seems to me that problem could be better met if you went farther out. Of course, that is a matter of personal opinion.

Mr. JONES. Again, Congressman, on the one hand you have that kind of factor and on the other hand you have to weigh the factor of the desirability of having people in locations where they can be in a day-to-day relationship so that you can exercise a fair degree of central supervision and direction of them.

Mr. GEORGE. That is all I wanted to ask, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Jones, do you think that you might change your thinking when you get full reports from these latest atomic tests?

Mr. JONES. No, sir.

Mr. LANHAM. Have you those available yet?

Mr. JONES. I cannot state that definitively, personally, sir. I think perhaps Colonel Potts can testify to that better. I think we know enough about the potentialities and possibilities to say that our original figure gives us a reasonable margin of safety.

Mr. LANHAM. I simply thought that the reports on those tests might change your thinking and you might come to the conclusion that you should go out farther than 20 miles.

Mr. JONES. No, sir. When I referred to that earlier I meant simply that I felt that perhaps the test reinforced the material that we presented to the committee earlier and would help to remove some of the doubts that had arisen as to whether we were not going out too far.

Mr. LANHAM. As I recall the testimony in the previous hearing, there was no testimony that glass windows were broken 100 miles away. I believe that kind of damage was limited to 8 or 10 miles. It seems to me this presents an entirely different picture. If plate-glass windows can be broken 100 miles away, it seems to me that if your locations are within 20 miles, you might have a great deal of damage. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BRAY. I have not read any of the previous testimony. You are proposing an authorization of $190,000,000 for six building areas; is that right?

Mr. JONES. No; that was for eight, Mr. Bray.

Mr. BRAY. For eight?

Mr. JONES. That has been pulled down approximately $45,000,000.

Mr. BRAY. These buildings that are going to be vacated, what will be done with the people who are pulled out of those areas? What

will be done with the buildings that remain here? Are you going to put other people in them?

Mr. JONES. Insofar as the wooden World War II temporary buildings are concerned, we would like to get out of them completely and tear them down. They are old. They were not strongly built in the first instance. They have absolutely no shock or blast protective qualities at all. They have no basements. They were built with the most readily available and least expensive materials they could find at the time and the result is that they are getting very, very difficult to maintain. Also they are both uncomfortable and dangerous to work in. We would like to get out of those completely.

Mr. BRAY. And the new buildings are going to be of a permanent type, of the very latest type of construction that we can put into a Government building?

Mr. JONES. They are a functional type of building, which Mr. Reynolds will go into, Mr. Bray, when he presents his testimony. They are not monumental type of buildings. They are not of the kind that we have in the Federal Triangle.

Mr. BRAY. Is there any reason why the functions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, for instance, could not be moved to Kansas, or any place other than the State of Indiana? Is there any reason why it could not be moved entirely away from this area?

Mr. JONES. If you could also move the other functions which work very closely with it, perhaps so. We could, perhaps, establish at one point a mapping center for all of the mapping activities of the United States Government; the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Geological Survey, the Navy Hydrographic Office, some of the special mapping functions that are carried on by the Army Map Service, the Aeronautical Chart Service, and so forth. But once you did that, Congressman, you would automatically create one of the highest priority targets that you could possibly imagine, because wars just cannot be fought without maps. You cannot even get ready for one without maps and we would not want to concentrate all of the mapping activities in one place.

Mr. BRAY. That was one reason why, frankly, I was thinking that it would be much safer to have it a thousand miles from here than in Washington. That is what I was thinking about.

Mr. JONES. If we had the time to find a place, 1,000 miles from Washington where we could carry out a dispersal of the mapping functions again within a reasonable radius of that central point, perhaps so. But I do not believe you would get any more protection and you would fairly seriously interfere with the continuity of operations that are necessary across the entire mapping field among these agencies which we now have here.

Mr. BRAY. Is it not an accepted fact that the nearer you are to the boundary, the more vulnerable you are to an air attack?

Mr. JONES. I do not know that that follows any longer, sir; not under the threat of the intercontinental bomber.

Mr. BRAY. If that does not follow, then your whole theory of interceptor, and so on, is futile.

Mr. JONES. No, I do not think so; because you need not, so far as your sea frontiers are concerned, throw a limit around what you can do with your interceptors, apart from the limitations of their own radius of operations. Land frontiers may be different. If there were

a threat of an attack coming from the south, unless we had some formal kind of treaty covering interdefense areas with the Republic of Mexico and with the Central American States, they might not think too well of having our protective devices operating over their own frontiers.

Mr. BRAY. That is the theory that I was taught on defense and I was looking at it particularly from a military standpoint. Now, I realize that this is not your fault, Mr. Jones, but it is typical of Government for various departments to come in and want more and more buildings and more and more employees, and there is tremendous pressure on that account. I could not help but think that we had sufficient room, sufficient buildings in Washington during the last war, which was the greatest war of all time. Yet now, with only 25 percent of the number of men in uniform that we had at that time, suddenly we find that it is necessary to expand.

Now, I know that this is not your function, that that perhaps is a military matter and we can discuss that with other witnesses. But if we are going to have just as many people again in Washington—and I have no doubt they will have just as many people working in Washington—if we follow your plan, we will have six additional targets in close proximity to Washington. I do not want to be argumentative, but that is the way it impresses me.

Mr. JONES. I do not believe, sir, that any one of these dispersed-location buildings would, in and of itself, be a target which would be worth while for an enemy to establish as a prime target, something that they would go after specifically.

Mr. BRAY. But when bombers are going over a target, traveling as fast as they do today, it seems to me that they would all be within the areas of bombing. Within a year you may have just as many people in Washington as you had during the war and if you establish six additional locations just outside of Washington, you will have that many more. I realize that perhaps this is not your province, and that perhaps the questions should be asked of someone else.

Mr. JONES. No; I think they are perfectly good questions, Congressman. But I do feel that the executive branch of the Government, at least, is very firmly of the opinion that World War II probably saw the maximum concentration that we could ever afford to put in the central Washington area. The last time we had it all right in downtown Washington. The next time we certainly should have a very substantial amount of it at least dispersed over an area within this 20-mile circle. That in itself gives a greater measure of protection.

There are other factors, of course, since World War II ended. We do have new programs, new functions of government which have come into being and which have a very substantial number of employees here.

If we should actually go to war, without any doubt, there would be a very sharp curtailment of many functions which under the concept of an emergency preparedness program are not being cut back as sharply as they would be if we came to war.

Mr. BRAY. Do you see any reason why the Social Security Board could not function better away from Washington, some place in the Midwest, and so that their building could be used by someone else?

Mr. JONES. That has been discussed at very great length and I do not think you can say that there is any particularly good reason why

most of the Federal Security Agency could not operate, insofar as its own programs are concerned, far removed from Washington.

Mr. BRAY. It impressed me that they could operate better.

Mr. JONES. As to part of its functions, I believe you are correct, Mr. Congressman. But when you take the organization as a whole, once again you have this problem of interlocking their work with that of several agencies.

Just to take one example, the Public Health Service or the Food and Drug Administration. The Public Health Service has to be in day-to-day contact with all of the other Government medical services and what they are doing, and the Food and Drug Administration has to know what are the problems of the Federal Trade Commission, what are the problems of the Department of Agriculture. There are very few agencies that, if they had only themselves to worry about, could not be put anywhere in the United States and function. But we do not believe that they can function effectively if they are cut off from the possibility of the day-to-day contact with the programs of their sister agencies.

Mr. BRAY. Thank you; that is all.

Mr. SCUDDER. Could I ask Mr. Jones one more question?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Scudder.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Jones, has there been any activity, or has there been any attention given to the shrinking or the elimination of the agencies whose usefulness has been served? I am thinking of the Farm Credit Administration. I know that out in the West, and I also hear from Texas and I know the honored gentleman of the Committee representing that great State is interested, that they would like to eliminate the Washington office because some of these Farm Credit Organizations are now self-supporting, and they do not want interference with their activities from Washington. Still this agency is occupying building space in Washington, I do not know how many people they employ locally, or how much space they occupy, and whether or not they perform any useful service to the agricultural credit organizations. Is there any thought being given to breaking up some of those agencies which were possibly necessary at one time, but which have now served their purpose, and that are now no longer of benefit to the agencies which they are still trying to force their services on? In my district the local farm credit associations are able to take care of their own affairs and the Washington red tape is only a millstone around their neck. I do not know how much space they occupy or how many employees they have, but I think some consideration should be given to the elimination of agencies which have served their purpose and that the country would be better off without their meddling into the affairs of the various agencies of the country.

Mr. MCGREGOR. What is the minimum distance from Washington that you recommend in order to carry on the day-to-day relations to which you refer?

Mr. JONES. On the basis of all the planning and thinking that we have been able to do, Mr. McGregor, we think this 20-mile circle, plus or minus a very few miles is the most efficient thing we can devise.

May I turn back to Mr. Scudder's question for a moment, Mr. Chairman?

We believe quite sincerely that the work of the Bureau of the Budget over the years has been and is dedicated to the continual

review of Government agencies and the elimination of useless functions.

You mentioned the Farm Credit Administration. It was one of the agencies which was large at the beginning of World War II, compared to some other functions of Government. It was decentralized in World War II. The Farm Credit Administration today has only a fraction of the employees that it had when decentralized 10 years ago. It did come back to Washington after the last war, in part, I may say, because there was a very insistent demand from Congress that it be brought back here to Washington. There were still many, many problems that individual members of Congress had with the Farm Credit Administration, and they wanted it here where they could have easy access to its personnel and records.

We give continuing attention to the problem of both cutting down and eliminating functions. There has been a very substantial wiping out of agencies if you take it in historical retrospect. It is difficult to say as of any given moment that this organization or that has outlived its usefulness, or that it is to be liquidated, but you do arrive at a point at which you can determine that either in the Executive Branch or in Congress. I am not prepared to say whether we have reached such a point with the Farm Credit Administration. I am only saying that it is a much smaller organization than it was 10 years ago.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Jones. Colonel Ramsay D. Potts of the National Security Resources Board.

Mr. POTTS. Yes, sir.

## STATEMENT OF RAMSAY D. POTTS, JR., SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Mr. TRIMBLE. Colonel Potts, you testified before the committee in December, and we would like to hear now any additional testimony that you think is relevent to this matter.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am a Special Assistant to Mr. Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and I am testifying before you as the representative of the Resources Board.

I would like to elaborate a bit on the statement that I made before your committee at the hearings during the last session of Congress. The question was asked of a previous witness, "why dispersal instead of decentralization?" This plan for dispersal is only one element in a comprehensive plan which envisages other moves and measures being taken in order to insure the continuity of Government operation, and to insure continuity in the functioning of the vital agencies of Government. Decentralization, meaning removal entirely from the vicinity of Washington, is also an element of the plan, but designed to accomplish a different purpose.

In trying to decide what measures should be taken to meet emergency conditions, or conditions that have been created by the existence of weapons of mass destruction, and the possession of those weapons of mass destruction by enemies of the United States, a committee made up of representatives from NSRB, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the State Department, the Federal Works Agency, and the Bureau of the Budget, considered whether or not various other things could not also be done in addition to dispersal. This committee

decided that decentralization was part and parcel of any over-all plan, and so recommended. Thus, we now have as part of the over-all plan a plan to decentralize the jobs of 25,000 people on a permanent basis.

Another thing that was considered was whether we could build bunkers or underground working spaces here in Washington which could be used to house some or all of these vital agencies. Because of the nature of Washington's terrain and also because of the very great expense involved in building underground working spaces with communications, air conditioning, and so forth in them, it was decided that it would be impractical and prohibitively expensive to house large numbers of workers underground in the Washington area, if it was intended that they should continue to function in those underground spaces and actually work there.

Another measure that was considered was a plan for utilizing regional offices as alternative headquarters. Some of the agencies of Government lend themselves readily to functioning with their headquarters in Washington, but with their regional offices in other sections of the country designated as alternate headquarters. The FBI is one such agency that I can think of, and there are various others. The thought in that case is to have assurance that there will be continuity in the operation of the agency, even though the central headquarters here in Washington is damaged or destroyed. So it was decided and recommended that those agencies which could operate with their regional offices as alternates should set up plans to provide that the regional offices would take over if the Washington headquarters was destroyed or damaged.

Another question that has been asked here is the question "What are we doing about the records?" A comprehensive plan is now underway to microfilm, duplicate, or to photostat all key and vital records, and to place the duplicate copies in safe places away from the Washington area. Those duplicate records could be drawn on if Washington were damaged or destroyed, and could be used to operate in either a dispersed site, or in a regional office if that particular agency had planned to operate from a regional office as an alternate headquarters.

It was decided however, to recommend dispersal as the major element in this over-all planning because of certain conditions, and I will try to develop for you those conditions.

First of all, the President decided that Washington would remain the seat of the Capital as long as it was habitable, and as long as it was tenable.

Secondly, it was decided that there would be certain key agencies and components of key agencies which would have to be in the vicinity of Washington in order to maintain face-to-face contact with the executive Departments, with the Congress, and with each other.

Third, it was thought that if these agencies which had to maintain close contact were placed too far away from Washington they could not readily communicate with each other and be in close day-to-day contact; and in the case of the head of an agency being in Washington he could not draw on his staff in developing plans, and he could not contact his people face-to-face or have them come in for meetings from day-to-day if they were too far away.

Therefore, it was recommended, that of the agencies necessary to carry on the functions of the Government, enough agencies or elements of agencies should be dispersed into outlying sites to insure that even though we had an attack here in the center of Washington, the Government could continue to function.

I would like to pose one question. What was the nature of the threat that induced our Committee to recommend such a drastic program? Briefly the threat is posed by Soviet Russia's possession of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction, and by Russia's capability to deliver those weapons on targets in the United States.

If we could make an estimate of the probability of an attack on the United States and specifically of the probability of an attack on Washington we might be in a better position to make an estimate of whether or not we wanted this dispersal program. It is impossible to make an estimate on a percentage basis of the probability of an atomic bomb falling on Washington.

None of us know whether we will be attacked by atomic bombs or other weapons of mass destruction, but we do know that those weapons are in existence in the hands of an enemy of the United States, and we do know that this enemy has many, many airplanes, not just two or three, or five or ten airplanes, but a very sizable number of airplanes that are capable of delivering those bombs on Washington and on other targets here in the United States.

We know that no air defense system, regardless of its efficiency, can intercept and destroy all of a large force of bombers before they get through to the target. We know that an air defense system can intercept and destroy a number of attacking bombers, but that some will get through. Since I am not now in the Air Force I would rather not make an estimate of the probable efficiency of an air defense system. I am sure that somebody from General Vandenberg's office could give you that sort of an estimate.

Dispersal, then, is designed to place out from the center of Washington the key functions of Government which would be necessary to insure the continuous operation of Government even though it was destroyed or damaged in the center. Dispersal is proposed instead of decentralization because it is felt that the key agencies should be close enough to the seat of Government, and the other agencies here in Washington, to maintain close contact and be readily accessible to each other.

Suppose this threat does not materialize, and suppose we do not have an attack on Washington? Then what have we lost by building these buildings in these dispersed sites?

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, we have lost nothing. Almost all of the city planners I have talked with, and especially the people who have been involved in planning for the future of the city of Washington, have stated that there is so much congestion in downtown Washington now that we need to take some of these working units and put them out of the city. We need to strengthen our communications and our transportation system and, if we do that, from a city-planning point of view we have done a very desirable thing. So even if this threat does not materialize we have made a sound investment in terms of highway improvements, in terms of relieving congestion in downtown Washington, and in terms of increasing the probable working efficiency of Governmental employees. However, if the

threat does materialize, then I think we will have been prudent and foresighted, and I think that $145,000,000, $190,000,000, or any other sum that I can imagine, even up to $500,000,000, would be a small price to pay for having insured that these agencies of Government would be able to pick up and carry on these vital functions during a disaster period resulting from the destruction of, or damage to, the central core of the city.

The dispersal plan is only, as I say, one element in the total over-all plan.

We have under way a comprehensive plan for duplicating records and putting the records out in safe places. That plan is about one-half completed now.

The Defense Department has an air defense plan, and the air defense system is being strengthened. That also is part of the over-all plan to insure the safety of the Capital.

The civil defense plan is under way, and anything that is done on this dispersal plan will have an impact on the effectiveness and efficiency of the civil defense plan. Improvements, for instance, in the road network would help civil defense measures, because better roads would relieve congestion in the center of Washington.

In other words, all of these various things now being done are interrelated, and are part and parcel of an over-all plan to insure that we are prepared for the very worst.

The question was raised here of distance. Why go out 20 miles to build these sites? Are we going too far out from Washington? Or are we going out far enough? I think it boils down in the final analysis to a question of judgment.

In closed session just before Christmas I told the committee of some of the factors bearing on distance that were considered, and I tried to enumerate them all. I cannot go into detail here, but I would like to sketch for you in outline the various factors that were considered in arriving at 20 miles as an approximate minimum distance from the center of Washington at which these new dispersed buildings should be located.

First of all was considered the probable aiming point of an enemy bomber attacking Washington. We know that the aiming point cannot be pin-pointed, but it was thought that if you took the Pentagon Building on one side and Capitol Hill on the other with the White House in the center, and drew a circle around those points that you would include within that circle the probable aiming points of a bomber making an attack upon the city. Roughly speaking, the probable aiming points are within a radius of 1½ miles from a zero point near the White House.

Next were considered the aiming errors inherent in the bombing problem. As a rough estimate it was considered that most of these errors would still produce bomb falls within 1½ miles of the aiming point. At Bikini during the atomic bomb test, one of the best air crews, under laboratory conditions, made an error of over 2,000 feet in the drop. It was discovered later that that error was due primarily to the ballistics of the bomb itself. In other words, the bomb did not drop as had been mathematically projected.

It was also considered that there might be multiple drops on Washington with not one bomb only, but perhaps three or four bombs being dropped on the city. If this were the tactic of the enemy then there

would have to be multiple aiming points and these aiming points might not be within the 1½ mile radius circle from the zero point near the White House.

Consideration was also given to the possibility that an atomic warhead might be delivered on Washington in the form of a guided missile from a submarine. Based on the V-1 experience during the last war, and given the known and future capabilities of long-range submarines to launch missiles from their decks, there does seem to be a possibility of an atomic missile being fired from the ocean on Washington as a target.

Another major consideration was the thought that it would be desirable if these dispersed sites were not depending upon the central water, sewerage, and other services of Washington. In other words, ir would be desirable and perhaps necessary for these dispersed sites to operate from services of their own and not to be dependent upon the services of the central city. Twenty miles was considered to be that minimum distance which would insure that these sites built up independent services of their own.

The question has been asked before this committee "how much further than 20 miles out can you go and still have this face-to-face contact and ready communication between the central part of the city and the agencies operating out on the fringe?" The answer to that question I think varies, depending upon the particular transportation network that exists from the central area of the city to the site. If you have a highway similar to the Shirley Highway running straight out from the Defense Department to a site, then there would not be much difference from the standpoint of ready contact between the site 20 miles out and the one 25 or 30 miles out. The difference would simply be a matter of a few more minutes in traveling over a four-lane highway.

Because, however, of the importance of communications and transportation in any dispersal scheme like the one being considered, improvements in the existing road networks have been considered as a vital element in the planning.

Specifically, there is one element in the plan which is of great importance. This is the construction of a circumferential road located approximately 10 or 12 miles from the center of the city and going completely around it. This type of road would then have spokes in the form of highways radiating out from the circumferential road to the site locations.

There are other matters, Mr. Chairman, which I took up in my testimony before the committee during the last session of Congress. I should like if it meets your approval to incorporate the testimony given at that time as part of my testimony in this record, and then, of course, answer any questions that the members of the committee may want to ask me.

STATEMENT OF RAMSAY D. POTTS, JR., SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD, DECEMBER 8, 1950 BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The CHAIRMAN. Will you give the reporter your name and the agency which you represent with respect to this legislation? We are glad to have any general statement you desire to submit.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, my name is Ramsay D. Potts, Jr., and I am a special assistant to the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, Mr. Symington.

The CHAIRMAN. In private life or in previous public life, what are your qualifications? Are you a doctor, lawyer, or engineer, or what, for the record?

Mr. POTTS. By profession, I am a lawyer, Mr. Chairman. In World War II I commanded a heavy bomber group in the Eighth Air Force in England and North Africa and later was director of bombing operations in that air force. I was then the Chief of the Military Analysis Division of the United States Strategic Bombing Survey, which after the war made surveys both in Germany and Japan of the effects of our air operations. I participated in writing some of the reports of that survey.

The CHAIRMAN. Such work continued until now—since World War II—or did you resume law practice?

Mr. POTTS. Since then I have resumed my law practice, but in the past year I have been on active duty for a short period in the Air Force, doing some special work last fall for the Secretary. Subsequently Mr. Symington has become the Chairman of the NSRB, and just recently I have gone to that agency to work for him as a special assistant.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman yield a moment?

I would like to say that Colonel Potts is from my city. He had a distinguished war record and is considered one of the brightest younger minds in our part of the country.

He can take care of himself, but I want to put that in the record early.

Mr. DONDERO. That is, second only to the Member of Congress from that district.

Mr. POTTS. That is a very flattering remark, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have a prepared statement, but it might be helpful for you if I reviewed briefly the role of the National Security Resources Board in the genesis of this plan.

Under the National Security Act of 1947, and as amended in 1949, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board is charged with advising the President on those measures which are deemed necessary for insuring the continued operation of the Government. In response to that charge laid on him by the act of 1947, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, at that time, Mr. Arthur Hill, had a group of men representing various Government agencies, chairmanned by the NSRB, start work in 1948 on planning what would be necessary in a time of emergency to carry on the necessary functions of the Federal Government. Representing the various agencies—or represented, I should say, in the group that made that study—were the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; the Department of State; the Munitions Board; the Federal Works Agency, which has since become part of General Services Administration; the Bureau of the Budget; and the National Security Resources Board.

Those men gave detailed consideration to all of the various alternatives and to all of the conditions that might arise in the event the Nation's Capital should come under attack. Some of those factors which were considered I might mention here.

First of all, they considered that the Soviet objectives were known, and they considered that country as the most likely enemy. They considered the capabilities of air vehicles for penetrating air defenses, and in that consideration they were guided by the most expert opinion from the Department of the Air Force and by World War II experience. They considered the capabilities of weapons of mass destruction, such as the A-bomb, the bomb that was dropped at Nagasaki and Hiroshima, and such various other hypothetical bombs as might come into existence at some time in the near future.

They considered also Washington's importance as a nerve center for the operation of the Government, and the high concentration of Government facilities in the center of the District.

They considered Washington's vulnerability from a geographical and a topographical standpoint, and the difficulty of constructing blastproof buildings and shelters. Mr. Larson has referred to that vulnerability in his statement.

Additionally, they considered the lead time necessary for constructing these buildings in the outlying areas. Mr. Larson has also referred to that as being 18 months to 2 years.

Finally, they considered the known facts about dispersal as being a recognized means of defending passively against any type of air attack.

After considering all of these various things, this group transmitted to Mr. Hill their recommendations, and he in turn studied them and then transmitted them to the President in October of 1948. That recommendation of October 1948 from the NSRB forms the basis and is the genesis of the present plan that Mr. Larson has presented to you.

Since that time, continuous study has gone into the plan. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, of General Services Administration, of the National Security Resources Board, of the Department of Defense, and of various other agencies have been working on numerous aspects of it.

The NSRB's responsibility, however, stops at the point where it recommends what it considers to be necessary to the President. The Bureau of the Budget and the General Services Administration pick up from there on and work out the details of the plan.

Mr. Chairman, that is simply an extemporaneous statement which I hope will give you some basis for assessing NSRB's role in this plan.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Potts.

Are there any questions?

Mr. DONDERO. Just a short question, Mr. Potts. I appreciated your very fine statement.

Mr. POTTS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. DONDERO. You heard me ask the colonel who was here whether or not any information is in your department of any other capital on the face of the earth making preparation against A-bombing or bombing by some enemy. You can say "Yes" or "No." I am not going to ask you for details.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Dondero, from time to time I have had access to certain classified information which is in the hands of the Department of Defense and the various military departments, but I am not free, of course, to divulge that to you. England certainly is making some plans, but I cannot tell you about the others. I would rather you got that from the Department of Defense.

The CHAIRMAN. With Mr. Dondero's permission, I will ask the colonel and the administrative assistant there to pass to the committee if they care to any information referred to by Mr. Potts that would be of help to the committee; and, of course, the committee will treat it as confidential.

Mr. DONDERO. Well, that was about all I had to ask. I had in mind particularly whether or not we have any information of what is going on behind the iron curtain, especially Moscow, Russia, because that is the only potential enemy that I can see that any bill of this kind is to be considered for. I know of no other country on the face of the earth that I think could or would bomb this Nation or this Nation's Capital excepting Russia. That is why I have that in mind and wondered whether or not any information has thus far been obtained.

Mr. POTTS. The Department of Defense may have some information on that, and I would rather they furnished it to you.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard what was said, did you, Colonel, and the administrative assistant. You gentlemen kindly remain, you may hear something else.

Are there any questions?

Mr. DONDERO. You reviewed the study that the Board has made on this question. In your opinion, do you think we are starting this a little late or should it have been started before this, this program, the whole program?

Mr. POTTS. Well, sir, I think we are starting a great many things a little bit late, including this dispersal program.

Mr. DONDERO. Do you know what is the anticipation of dispersal of Government functions in the District of Columbia; do you know whether a study by your Board was before the United Nations was established?

Mr. POTTS. No, sir. The United Nations was established just at the conclusion of World War II, and this study started in 1948.

Mr. DONDERO. Was the study pointed at the danger of attack from atomic bomb more than it was the necessity of dispersing Government buildings because of congestion in the District of Columbia?

Mr. POTTS. NSRB's study was directed primarily at dispersion as a means of passive defense, and as a means of locating key elements of the agencies that would be necessary to carry on the war in these dispersed locations, so that the Government could carry on if the center of Washington was struck by some weapon of mass destruction.

Mr. DONDERO. Without reference to congestion or traffic conditions or population in a certain area.

Mr. POTTS. Naturally, in considering dispersion, we came up against the planning that had been done by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the planning that was being suggested by certain authorities in the field of city planning, and it seemed to us to be fortuitous that this dispersion plan fitted in so nicely with the plans for the development of the Capital and the area around the District of Columbia, which plans were to relieve this congestion that you speak of.

Mr. DONDERO. Has your Board given study to dispersal plans of Government functions in other parts of the United States besides the Capital?

Mr. POTTS. Yes; we considered decentralization of certain of these functions. But the President made the decision that he would like to carry on the functions of the Government here in Washington, and therefore in order to provide reasonably close access of the key agencies to Congress and to the other executive groups that would stay in Washington, it was decided that dispersal would be the most effective way of doing that.

Mr. DONDERO. That this should be put into effect first but that there are studies of dispersal of Government functions in other parts of the United States?

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Larson spoke of the decentralization of certain functions, and those functions which can be carried on permanently in other locations will probably be transposed into other locations and carried on there.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there any study by your board on dispersal of—recommendations of industry on account of atomic attack?

Mr. POTTS. As you know, the Government does not have the authority, or has not had the authority, to tell industry where they will locate their plants. However, beginning back as early as 1948, NSRB drew up a brochure, a copy of which I have here, called National Security Factors in Industrial Location and we have been urging the various corporations and industries involved in building new plants to consider strategic vulnerability and dispersion in locating those plants just as they consider other things, such as manpower electric power supply, and so forth.

In addition to that, I might say this: That in exercising its function of granting certificates of necessity for purposes of amortizing over a 5-year period new plant construction, NSRB is now considering dispersion and strategic vulnerability as among other factors in deciding whether or not to grant those certificates.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, even if a plant facility is capable of meeting all the requirements of the Government in the production of some technical—some particular essential armament, and it is poorly located, you would not grant a certificate of necessity to that plant if it were subject to an attack by the enemy, but would recommend that it be located in some other place?

Mr. POTTS. I do not want to give the impression that this is the only thing considered. For instance, if a new steel plant is going up somewhere, this would be one of the factors considered. You cannot locate steel plants out in the middle of Arkansas because of the various other factors involved. However, I would say this with respect to industrial plant location, as contrasted with the location of the Federal Government agencies: there is only one Federal Government. There are many steel plants. There are a lot of airplane manufacturing plants. There are some in Forth Worth, some in Connecticut, some in Kansas, some on the west coast. Even those in California are dispersed and are not all packed in closely together. So with industrial dispersion you have another problem. This problem of the location of the units of the Federal Government in the heart of Washington is a separate and distinct problem. I would urge you to so consider it.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. DAVIS. I submit that my original statement has been confirmed.

The CHAIRMAN. I am in accord.

I am sure you will keep in mind that in asking for dispersal of essential industry, if you have any information on that, that for the dispersal of the motion picture industry down there in Los Angeles, we can accommodate a few of those girls in Mississippi.

Mr. Potts, as you stated, and I think I understood you correctly, in your contacts with the General Services Administration, what you emphasized was facilities for the functioning of the Government during wartime and in the event of attack in the matter of dispersal. That is the thing that is uppermost in our minds.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I would like to thank you, Colonel Potts, for this additional statement, and the Chair has those things in mind.

We have only about 15 minutes now until the House convenes, and if we start in questioning you it will take more time than that. I think we had better adjourn, if it is the will of the subcommittee, until 2 o'clock and take up the questioning of Colonel Potts at that time. Can you come back at 2 o'clock?

Mr. POTTS. Yes, sir, I can.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I feel that we will be permitted to meet this afternoon because there is nothing, I understand, very important in the House to be considered. Then after Colonel Potts finishes I want to hear from General Schmidt. Is Mr. Hayden of the Department of Defense here?

Mr. Hayden. Yes, sir.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Can you come back at 2 o'clock, Mr. Hayden?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TRIMBLE. And Mr. Reynolds is supposed to be back at 2 o'clock. You can be back here at 2 o'clock?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

Mr. TRIMBLE. We will adjourn, then, until 2 o'clock.

(Thereupon, at 11:36 a. m., the subcommittee adjourned until 2 o'clock of the same day.)

AFTER RECESS

(The subcommittee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 2 p. m., Hon. James W. Trimble (subcommittee chairman) presiding.)

## FURTHER STATEMENT OF RAMSEY D. POTTS, JR., SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL SECURITY RESOURCES BOARD

Mr. TRIMBLE. The subcommittee will be in order, and Colonel Potts will please resume his testimony.

Colonel Potts, you are here for the purpose of questioning by the various members of the subcommittee, and the other members of the subcommittee will be in pretty soon. I noticed in your testimony this morning you said that Washington was not suitable for underground shelters, or that it was not the policy of the Department. What was your statement on that?

Mr. POTTS. I said, Mr. Chairman, that the terrain of Washington does not lend itself to the construction of underground working spaces where people could work permanently, as they would if you were building an underground factory to manufacture jet engines. In some cases there is terrain where you might build an underground office in the side of a hill or in a ravine. I did not mean to imply that there were not places here where you could build underground shelters which would be useful, and which could be used for civilian defense. There might even be a few places where you could put some underground office space. I am thinking specifically of the outskirts of the city where the ground rises a little higher.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Your statement, then, this morning pertained more to the general terrain of Washington?

Mr. POTTS. Yes, sir; the water level, as we all know, is very close to the surface.

Mr. TRIMBLE. What is the general policy of the Department with reference to underground shelters or buildings?

Mr. POTTS. Well, sir, we have left the specific selection or use of any underground space up to the General Services Administration. Our policy has been to back this dispersal plan, counting on that to take care of elements of all of these key agencies in order to insure the continuous operation of the Government.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Larcade.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions of Mr. Potts, but I just have the thought that, perhaps, it might be a good idea, and I would suggest that the chairman of the subcommittee consider inviting Mr. Potts to return before the subcommittee in executive session just prior to our final action on this bill, because I believe that, perhaps, there might be some information which Mr. Potts might not be able to disclose publicly, information which is classified which might be of great interest to the subcommittee and have some bearing on this whole question. It is my opinion that the subcommittee might be interested in having Mr. Potts return to testify at a closed executive session of the subcommittee.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I was thinking of that, too. In view of the statements made this morning it might be well to have some member of the Air Corps here, too, before we finally act on this. We will take that under advisement.

Mr. SCUDDER. I have no questions to ask, Mr. Chairman, but I do believe that Mr. Larcade's suggestion is very timely, and I would like to have further information to guide me in my actions on this matter. I appreciate the information you have given us.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, on the question of bomb damage I would like to say that the damage that Hiroshima and Nagasaki suffered is not classified, and the one interesting fact about blast damage from bombs that I think I should point out to the committee is that when you increase the power of the bomb you do not in the same proportion increase the radius of blast damage. The radius of damage is roughly the cube root of the expanded destructive power. So that if you had a bomb five times the potential of the Hiroshima bomb, let us say, you would not have a radius of damage five times the radius of damage at Hiroshima.

If you go on and take a bomb 400 times the power of the Nagasaki type of bomb, the radius of blast damage to buildings repairable while occupied is roughly 14.8 miles. It can be seen that the blast damage of any explosive is a finite thing. Even with a 400x bomb we would still have some margin of safety at a distance of 20 miles from the explosion.

Mr. TRIMBLE. That is an interesting statement because like myself you would just think, well, if it is 400 times as powerful the damage is proportionately great.

Mr. POTTS. Yes, sir; it might be thought that the damage goes out 400 times the radius.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Are there any questions?

Mr. DAVIS. Colonel, I am beginning to change my whole notion about this thing. You know the people in all the agencies that are designed to go out seem to be the least important people. You are going to keep General Marshall and all of the top echelon people right here in the city of Washington, but the so-called unnecessary people are going to be sent out 20 miles away. Did you ever stop to think about that?

When this started I had an absolutely open mind, and to be perfectly frank with you I thought it ought to be done, but the more I think about spending $145,000,000 for this purpose, the more I think why do we not just be honest with ourselves and say that we need more space for the employees of this Government and we are just going to build some more buildings, and then when we come to that

conclusion, just get the authorizing legislation so that Mr. Reynolds, one of the most competent men in the Federal establishment, can go ahead and design his buildings and put people in there?

I have come to that conclusion, Colonel. I have great respect for you, but here we are leaving Mr. Symington in Washington, we leave the National Security Resources Board here, and we leave the Supreme Court and General Marshall in Washington, and we leave the Chief of Staff in Washington and the admirals and all of the key people. Of course, I know this is classified—you say you have certain communication centers and so forth which might not be too far away, but I just do not believe we are being fair with ourselves. Why do we not just come up and say we need more employees and more space for employees?

I think Mr. Bray made one of the most important observations of the hearing when he said why do we need so many more people to run this war when we ran the last big one and had four times as many men and women in uniform as we expect to have now? We expect to have 3½ million now, and we had 15 million in the last war. So, Colonel, if you were going to put the high echelon people out of the city I would say all right, I would take your judgment and say let us go out 20 miles and build some of these permanent-type structures. They have been mulling over this in the Department for 2 years. Now, this committee started taking testimony in December, and it has been over on the Senate, and boiled down what we need is more people to do this work. We had the OPA controls and all of that sort of business, and we had the WPB in the last war. So, if we repeat all of that we ought to just put them back in here again. I am going to ask Mr. Reynolds when he comes on the stand where in the name of Heaven have we built up all of these thousands and thousands of additional people to require this additional space.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, I do not ask questions. I just make speeches. That is all.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The gentleman from Tennessee made a very interesting and informative statement. Of course, I think if the Chair may make one speech, the whole question comes down to the question of whether or not there is any danger from the atomic bomb which has been developed practically since the war. We are either in danger or we are not in danger.

Mr. GEORGE. I think we are in danger. It is a question of whom you are going to protect in this dispersal.

Colonel POTTS. Mr. Chairman, may I try to answer Mr. Davis' question about the nature of the agencies that are going out?

I have not seen the full list, with each agency tabbed, because it has not been completed. Some of the Defense Department agencies are not on that list yet; but on that list now we have a sizable proportion of the State Department, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Civil Defense Agency, the Defense Production Administration, and various other agencies such as the mapping services.

The reason why the top people are left here in Washington is because they have to be always on call for executive meetings and for meetings with Congress, and so forth.

This plan does not consider any individual person, as a person, indispensable. It takes into consideration the fact that if you have

away from the city the nucleus of an organization, and if you have somebody down an echelon from the top who knows the workings of the organization, that then in time of disaster, if everybody in the city should be wiped out, you could still pick up and carry on the operation without having that top person who formerly headed up the agency.

That, in effect, is the thinking behind the placement of certain of these agencies at these dispersal sites. You can go over the list, agency by agency, and see that most are in effect key agencies. All are supposed to be key agencies. We have not yet had a chance to sift the list down. They are supposed to be all key agencies, all or parts of which would be necessary to carry on properly the functioning of the Government.

Mr. McGregor. I wonder if the picture has changed any since you reported to the subcommittee of the committee. Has the explosive power changed?

Colonel Potts. No, sir. We still have the hypothetical things that are possible. I would say the information I gave then would still be valid.

Mr. Trimble. Thank you very much, Colonel Potts. We may call you for an executive session.

The next witness will be Maj. Gen. W. R. Schmidt, Chairman of the Department of Defense Joint Decentralization Board.

## STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. W. R. SCHMIDT, CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE JOINT DECENTRALIZATION BOARD

General Schmidt. Mr. Chairman, the Defense Department witnesses who have appeared before this committee previously feel that the testimony they have given should stand as it was given. I have very little more to add. I do have here a prepared statement which has the approval of the Secretary of Defense, and in brief it simply states that the Defense Department supports this building program. It agrees with the principle of dispersion as a military defense measure. The Defense Department has been working for 2 years with the General Services Administration on this program and is in general concurrence with their position.

That, briefly, is the statement here.

Mr. Trimble. It is practically the same statement that Mr. Hayden made before the committee in December?

General Schmidt. Yes.

Mr. Trimble. You may insert that statement in the record at this time.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

The Department of Defense is in agreement with the dispersal plan for the security of the Nation's Capitol. The Department of Defense urges the passage of the bill before your committee for consideration today.

It is essential for the security of the Nation's Capitol that elements of the Department of Defense and other Government agencies essential to the defense program and to the successful prosecution of the Government's business, be dispersed from the downtown area. Dispersal is a basic concept held by the military for a long period of time.

The Department of Defense has no plans for dispersal of departmental activities other than the plan covered by this bill. It is possible that the planned creation of a supplemental communication installation at a nearby military post may have been interpreted to mean that the Defense Establishment has provided for its own dispersal. This interpretation is not correct.

The Department of Defense has worked with the General Services Administration over 2 years in developing this program of dispersal. The Defense Department, has, however, been studying its organization for some time to determine what functions can be performed or should be performed in the dispersal area or completely removed from the Washington area. The result of this study is now being prepared for submission to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. To disperse congested military functions will insure continuity of operation and should be expedited.

Mr. McGregor. You are talking strictly from a defense viewpoint, not from the viewpoint of space needed for Federal employees?

General Schmidt. Yes; but we believe since space is needed we should give consideration to the military problems involved in the defense of the National Capital.

Mr. McGregor. Do you recommend this legislation, from your own viewpoint, as being necessary for the defense of the various departments that you are associated with?

General Schmidt. Yes; we do.

Mr. McGregor. What do you have to say about the other departments that are not included in this group?

General Schmidt. All the critical key departments should have some space in this dispersal area? That is the way we feel about it.

Mr. McGregor. I take it for granted that you have taken into consideration the artery of travel to and from and the congestion that might result in the various streets and roads. You still feel that we should have this decentralization out 20 miles? Is that your recommendation?

General Schmidt. Yes, 20 miles, more or less, depending upon the availability of land. Eighteen miles to 24 miles. That figure has been given considerable study and has been approved by the Defense Department.

Mr. McGregor. You have gone into what is necessary in the changing of the routes from the District of Columbia to these various points?

General Schmidt. No, sir. We know in a general way what the General Services Administration proposes. We think their belt road idea is a splendid one. It certainly would assist in the evacuation of the city, or the moving of troops quickly to an affected area.

Mr. McGregor. I question whether or not we would have the transportation facilities if we were attacked here at 4 or 5 o'clock, or if there should happen to be a troop movement at the time that 40,000 people were going to be released from their office work and started back into Washington. I do not think it is humanly possible and physically possible to put arteries of highways enough to take care of it all. I am wondering how vast a program you are going to have to have of streets, bridges, and so forth, to get these people to and from these buildings during the socalled rush hour periods.

General Schmidt. I believe that Mr. Reynolds can answer all those questions. I am not familiar with the details. I have a general picture of the plan and do know that it would improve the situation that presently exists. It is bound to—any additional roads, particularly the belt road.

Mr. Bray. What part of Defense is to be moved out there?

General Schmidt. We had to submit to the Bureau of the Budget a tentative list. It is a pretty tentative list because definite determination has not been made as to the space we will get.

Mr. BRAY. I believe you mentioned that the National Guard Bureau would be moved out.

General SCHMIDT. Yes.

Mr. BRAY. Would it be moved out there because it would be more useful or less useful than leaving it in the Pentagon?

General SCHMIDT. Our dispersal planning has not been completely finished and when we submitted that list it was understood that it was tentative.

Mr. BRAY. You already have the engineers away from there and the Quartermaster General.

General SCHMIDT. Yes; but they are still within the mile and a half of the zero milestone.

Mr. BRAY. I do not believe they mentioned either the engineers or the Quartermaster General being moved out this morning. They would be moved out. The National Guard Bureau and several others are to be taken out into this dispersal area.

I noticed in the papers that there are already 28,000 in the Pentagon. Is that roughly correct?

General SCHMIDT. That is roughly correct.

Mr. BRAY. Then you are going to have about 10,000 out in the new area, or has that been determined? From the Army, how many will be out there in the dispersal area?

General SCHMIDT. Well, I do not have that broken down into figures. I could get you the information.

Mr. BRAY. Will they be moved from the Pentagon out there, or will you just leave the Pentagon full and bring more people in and put them out there?

General SCHMIDT. Some will be moved from the Pentagon, some from the present Quartermaster General's office, and some from the Chief of Engineers, and so on.

Mr. BRAY. There will be still just as many in the Pentagon after that as there are now, will there not?

General SCHMIDT. There probably will be.

Mr. BRAY. It is not a matter of dispersal; it is a matter of just getting more people in the office out there; is that not it?

General SCHMIDT. Not completely; no, sir. You see, there will be some Quartermaster people down here where they presently are and some in the dispersal area. If one place goes the other can continue to function. That is the way I visualize it.

Mr. BRAY. I believe the point was made by Mr. Davis that the idea is not for dispersing people out of Washington; it is for leaving them here and putting a lot more in the vicinity of Washington. That is what will happen, is it not?

General SCHMIDT. Well, if you consider that we expand tremendously when we mobilize, it would probably amount to that. We expect to ship some people completely out of Washington.

Mr. BRAY. But if we expand to 12,000,000 in the Army you would have to build four more Washingtons. There is the same rate of expansion in the civil employees as there is in the military.

General SCHMIDT. We do not anticipate as many in the military as we had in World War II.

Mr. BRAY. You mean that it would not take any more to take care of 12,000,000 than it does 3,000,000 that we not have?

General SCHMIDT. It would not take many more.

Mr. SCUDDER. In this dispersal program you are going to construct buildings for people to work in 7 or 8 hours a day for 5 days out of the week. Are we trying to house our manpower or just have a place to store information? If we are talking about manpower and the people in key positions, they are going to spend 60 percent or more of their time in Washington and you will not have dispersed them at all. They would not put in more than 35 percent of their day in that area. Would you not still have a problem of eliminating all of the key people in the event of a bombing if 65 to 70 percent of their living hours are spent in the city of Washington? The enemy is not going to wait until they are all out on the job in these various places to drop a bomb. More than likely they will figure to drop that bomb at night and you will have all of your high echelon in the apartment houses and the hotels in Washington.

I think that there should be a definite requirement that the key people who are working in those places should be dispersed from Washington at the same time in order to get the protection we are talking about.

General SCHMIDT. That is a definite possibility. You will find in the military population here that the trend is to areas convenient to their jobs. You will find the southeast section across the Anacostia River pretty well populated by Air Force people. We have a large population over in Virginia. While it is possible that a great many key people might be killed in a bombing raid, and we anticipate that there will be, we cannot by any manner of means expect that all of them will be.

Mr. SCUDDER. That is the reason I projected the question this morning that, in the location of this area in which we are going to set up our agencies, there should be provided the possibility for residing in that area, which would be convenient to the employees, and also it would be a decentralization of the people in the high echelon who would be necessary to carry on if a bomb should hit Washington proper.

General SCHMIDT. We anticipate that there will be building in those areas. There will be a demand for places to live and people will gravitate toward them. It will be some time before it is developed.

Mr. SCUDDER. You will work toward that end?

General SCHMIDT. Yes.

Mr. TRIMBLE. General Smith, I am sure that every member of the subcommittee and the full committee wants to do the best thing for his country, and that they want to use their best judgment on it.

Let me see if I am clear on the defense angle of this. If I understand your testimony, it is that you are not particularly concerned with the number of people involved but you want a dispersal so that you will have a core of command in all the vital agencies in case of a disaster.

General SCHMIDT. You are limiting that question to our vital agencies?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Yes.

General SCHMIDT. We are interested in protection for the entire Government, not only the military. If there is chaos in government our job is multiplied many times.

Mr. TRIMBLE. And that all gets back to a defense situation in case we are bombed?

General SCHMIDT. Yes. We think it is as important for the State Department to be out there, the CIA, and other vital agencies as Defense.

Mr. TRIMBLE. All vital agencies, whether State Department, Army, Navy, Air Force, or what, will have a core or nucleus outside Washington to carry on?

General SCHMIDT. Yes.

Mr. TRIMBLE. We thank you very much, General Schmidt.

Our next witness will be Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings.

Mr. Reynolds, you may give any other additional evidence that you have.

## STATEMENT OF W. E. REYNOLDS, COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. REYNOLDS. My name is W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings.

Mr. Jess Larson, Administrator of General Services, cannot be here. He asked that his testimony given previously be made a part of the record subject to such changes as I may indicate in my testimony. I make the same observation in regard to the testimony that I previously have given.

When I appeared before this committee before I suggested that there be authorized $190,000,000 for the construction of 8 buildings, each housing 5,000 persons, at 8 separate and dispersed locations. Our calculations were made on two bases which I want to make clear to this committee because I think there has been some confusion in connection with it.

We were required to make an analysis of what the long-time needs of the Federal establishment would be in Washington so that in this emergency we would not build more permanent buildings than would be required.

Secondly, we were required to make an estimate of the number of people that would be in the Washington area in time of full mobilization, so we could determine again the space needs at that time.

When I appeared before you last, I estimated that the normal number of employees in the executive branch would be 180,000 persons, which, based upon past experience in the Government, was a conservative figure. From that I assumed that 126,000 persons could be housed in present permanently owned buildings in Washington and in the immediate vicinity. I assumed that 6,500 persons could be handled in rented space in Washington, and a further assumption that 8,000 persons would be decentralized, and when I speak of decentralization I mean those people that could be moved to any part of the United States outside of Washington.

The words "dispersal" and "decentralization" have been used interchangeably, but "dispersal" means in the periphery of Washington. "Decentralization" means any spot in the United States, so I assumed 8,000 persons. It showed then that the total space requirements for permanent buildings in the Washington area would be for 39,500 persons, which could be met by 8 buildings of 5,000 persons each.

Since that time the Bureau of the Budget has increased the number of people that could be decentralized to a base of 22,000, which would expand to 25,000 in time of emergency.

By making this adjustment the permanent space requirements, as we see them at the moment, would be for approximately 30,000 persons, which could be met by the purchase of 6 sites rather than 8, and with a building at each site housing 5,000 persons.

Now, in a time of full emergency that figure moves up to 70,000 persons.

The question was raised in previous testimony—how it was possible to carry on the war, World War II, in the housing that existed and which must exist at this time.

There are two answers to the reason that it cannot be. One of them, and the most important, is that if you look at it from a space angle only, we rented 6,200,000 square feet during World War II and much of that space is not now available to us. It is in private enterprise today, and there is not over 25,000 square feet of space available in the District of Columbia which may be termed reasonable office space. The only way we can get additional space is to take apartment houses that are now being constructed, and we are at present in the process of taking two of those.

So I have an amendment to suggest to section 3 of the bill before this committee which I would like to read and make a part of the record.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of General Services $145,000,000 for acquisition of sites for, and the construction thereon, and equipping of permanent buildings and for the provision of facilities thereon, and equipping of permanent buildings and for the provision of facilities as provided for in section 1 of this Act. In addition, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator of General Services such sums as may be necessary for the construction and equipping of semifinished buildings on such sites and for the further provision of facilities as provided for in section 1 of this Act. Appropriations provided under this authority shall remain available until expended.

Now, the primary purpose of this legislation is to assure the continued operation of those vital functions and activities of the Federal Government by so dispersing and protecting necessary facilities, records, and personnel that such operation cannot be seriously disrupted by enemy action.

In World War I the expansion was provided by what might be called semifinished buildings, and a great number of temporary buildings. The temporary buildings were wood structures and they were largely scattered throughout the Mall. During the interval of time between World War I and World War II most of these buildings were removed. There still remain, however, in the Mall area, the Munitions Building and the Navy Building on Constitution Avenue, and temporary E building, which is in the center of the Mall. These buildings are of concrete construction.

During the last war we built additional temporary buildings all around the Washington area, many of them on the Mall, and they are purely temporary. As I indicated before, in testimony before this committee, we built them so they would fall down in 5 years. We now have housed in these temporary buildings 48,000 people.

When I testified before this committee in early December that number was 45,000. Of the 48,000, about 17,000 are in buildings such as the Munitions Building, the Navy Building, and temporary E. The remainder are in these wooden-frame shacks which are highly flammable, and all personnel records and everything would be

completely destroyed in case of an atomic attack on the city of Washington.

Collateral with the necessity of dispersal of functions for the protection of the Government, we have the very practical problem of providing space for people who are coming into Washington. We can show this committee, and I think I have shown it in previous testimony, that it is going to be absolutely essential for us to build, and build quickly, by resorting to a combination of office buildings, either permanent, semipermanent, semifinished, or temporary buildings, in order to meet this expansion.

Now, I was largely responsible, I think, for the temporary buildings that were built during World War II. I think that was the greatest mistake that I ever made since I have been in Government, because they represent a total capital loss except for the 10 or 12 years that they have been occupied. My notion of this thing is this—regardless of what type of buildings we build, such as a wing type or a block type, or something else, that at least it should have a permanent frame and then could be developed later into a permanent building, for the storage of files, records, and so forth, and then we would not have a capital loss. That can be done without too much expense. It will not cost much more than building a temporary building of timber construction.

Those of us who have studied the development of Washington for a great number of years have realized for a long time that there is far too much concentration of Government buildings in the downtown area, quite apart from the threat of the atomic bomb. The first break-away from downtown Washington was when we went out to Suitland, which is about 6 or 7 miles by road from the Capitol.

At that time we bought 425 acres of land and built three-story walk-up buildings which have proved very useful and still serve their purpose and will be permanent 20 years from now with reasonable maintenance.

I have therefore been advocating for a good many years that buildings be moved into the peripheral area of Washington.

The atomic bomb presents another picture. We have concentrated practically all Government functions within a 2-mile radius of the White House at the present time. If we must build buildings—and I cannot see how it is possible to avoid it—then it seems sensible for us to build them so they not only conform to a pattern which has developed over the years as being the proper one, but sufficient distance out so that they will give reasonable protection to those functions of Government which are vital to the conduct of a war. This policy is being carried out in other countries.

I know that there has been a great amount of discussion, both in the committee and outside, about the expenditure of funds for the development of highways. The breakdown of the $145,000,000 includes an item of $32,500,000 for highway construction. The remainder is for permanent buildings and a communications set-up between these buildings and the central portion of Washington so that if the downtown area is bombed, or any of these centers bombed, the communication system will still be intact.

It was clearly demonstrated in the last war, certainly in France, that communication was the very heart of carrying on a war. Some considerable stress has been laid on that factor in this decentralization

program. There is included in this estimate of $145,000,000, $5,400,000 for that purpose.

I want now to discuss the proposed amendment to section 3 so that you will clearly understand what it means.

Our present space demands show we will require space for in excess of 30,000 persons. The first portion of this amendment to section 3 authorizes $145,000,000 for permanent buildings which would house 30,000 persons. The second sentence of this bill is an open authorization for semifinished buildings so that when the time is appropriate we can appear before the Appropriations Committee and justify additional funds for semifinished buildings.

I want to make clear what I am talking about when I am talking about semifinished buildings. I am talking about concrete frames which can be built almost as cheaply as wood frames. We would put in there minimum inside and outside finishes. We would leave off the plaster. We would expose the piping. We would use fixtures that would give proper lighting but at minimum cost. There would be a minimum expense for mechanical equipment.

Now, if those buildings are designed in that manner, then in 10 years from now, if there is need for more permanent buildings, the investment that is put into those buildings will not be lost because to the extent of the frames, elevator shafts, and so forth, they will be exactly the same as a permanent building.

Now, as the demand for space increases, and when you get thinking in the category of sixty or seventy thousand, my thinking there is that those buildings should be simply two-story warehouse construction so that when the emergency is over they can be used for the storage of files, records, film storage, and things of that nature.

To give you an indication that we have room for that sort of thing, there are approximately 4,000,000 square feet of space in the District of Columbia which are now occupied by files and records.

Mr. McGregor. Rented or owned by the Government?

Mr. Reynolds. Both.

Mr. McGregor. How much rental space?

Mr. Reynolds. I would have to check the figures. Some of that is in fairly good office space.

Now, under the records program that we are carrying out in General Services, and by filming a lot of these records, that volume is gradually going down.

The only thing that I am pointing up to is the fact that we can build a two-story warehouse almost as cheaply as you can build one of these buildings that we have down here on the Mall. You can do that as far as the frame is concerned, and then you will have a capital investment when you get through for a longer period of use.

There were a good many questions raised by the committee to previous witnesses which I have not attempted to cover. I shall be very glad to answer any questions that the committee may have.

Mr. McGregor. Commissioner, I am not sure that I followed your trend of thought relative to the second amendment that you have. If I understood it, the section where you are asking for the blank check, will that be for the remodeling and the taking over of buildings now in the confines of the District of Columbia?

Mr. Reynolds. No; it will not. I particularly emphasized the second sentence of this section to show you it was a blank check.

If we purchase 6 sites and develop the utilities and so forth, and we put 5,000 persons in each site, we can immediately build 6 additional buildings of semifinished character on those same sites, which would give you 10,000 persons at each site. I used the 10,000 figure because the National Security Resources Board has told us they do not want more than 10,000 on any one site. That would provide for sixty of the seventy thousand, and if it is necessary to build for the other 10,000, we will go to some Government land in the vicinity of Washington and build because there is quite a little Government land available, although it is a little closer than the 20-mile limit, plus or minus.

Mr. McGregor. I think that clarifies the situation as far as I am concerned.

You know, I am pretty much in accord with the statement which was made this morning by Congressman Davis. We have talked over this thing a number of times. I think it boils down to this situation—I am not sold on the defense end of it because I do not think that you can build a bomb shelter for one certain class of American citizens because there are others that are just as important. We are possibly desperately in need of office space for people who are going to be sent into Washington. I recognize that you are not bringing them here, you do not head that department, but the departments responsible for bringing in those people are telling you that they have to have more space and you are telling the committee that you have to have the space.

I am going now to ask you this question: Is it not true that the basic argument for this legislation is office space rather than defense?

Mr. Reynolds. I would say just to the contrary, that the basic argument for it is the protection of those functions of Government that need to be protected. I do not want to minimize, however—and from my viewpoint let me make this clear—the importance of providing space. That is the No. 1 thing in this bill from the viewpoint of space, but from the over-all Government viewpoint I would not say that it is the No. 1 objective. These buildings that we propose to construct in these dispersal areas are not bomb shelters or citadels; they are simply the ordinary type of office building. If we try to provide the protection the National Security Resources Board feel that paramount essential agencies should have in areas within the confines of the District of Columbia in citadel structures, the cost would be far more than we are talking about here on account of the terrain and everything else involved—the ground-water level and things of that nature.

Mr. McGregor. I dislike to disagree with you because I admire you very much, but you know I think there are just as many people in the country back in Ohio or in Indiana that play as important a part in the functions of our Government as some of these men in the so-called higher echelons in Washington, so if we are going to protect Washington we ought to protect them back in our respective areas, and I recognize that it would be impossible for us to do that.

Mr. Reynolds. We are not attempting to protect people; we are attempting to protect functions. If these buildings are built I will not be moved to one of them because I am dispensable.

Mr. McGregor. Congressmen are, too.

Mr. REYNOLDS. They are dispensable, but their positions are not, especially in the House, because you have no means of reestablishing the House except by election. In the Senate you can handle it pretty quickly.

Mr. REYNOLDS. But I do want to emphasize, Mr. McGregor, that we are talking here about protecting functions of government and at a cost very little more than it would be to put up buildings, say, 7 or 8 miles out rather than 20. The only difference is in your road construction.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You are talking about functions of government, but you are not including in this dispersal program the judicial or the legislative departments. I do not want to be included in the group that is going out there. But I think it is going to be very difficult to determine just who is going and what functions of government are going to be protected, because—and I repeat—I think one has very much to do with the other. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I might ask Mr. Reynolds a couple of questions more or less for the record. Mr. Reynolds, after the committee had under consideration this bill during the last session, and just prior to the time that Mr. Whittington retired, he made a statement that he thought the committee would like to have details about this proposal; and among them there had been no details furnished the committee on the highways to be built or rebuilt or used; there were no plans available for meeting housing needs, and other related needs. It is not at all clear, too, that the A-bomb menace calls for going as far out as 20 miles. Also, that no exact list of what agencies or parts of agencies to be dispersed have been furnished by the administration.

Of course, this morning, in his testimony, Mr. Jones furnished a list of the agencies which it was proposed to disperse, which list I presume is flexible and can be changed. But one of the questions that seems to be bothering those areas where these dispersal buildings may be constructed is the consequent influx of 5,000 or 10,000 people into a community or into the environs of a community and the additional cost made necessary with respect to furnishing the necessary services and utilities that might be required for an increased population of 5,000 or 10,000 people who might be organizing a community adjacent to the dispersal buildings to be constructed in the area:

The thought occurred to me, in view of these questions that have been raised—and also I read in the newspapers about the appearance before the Senate committee of representatives of communities in Maryland and Virginia who seem to be concerned about this question; that is, several of the communities where it is anticipated that some of these buildings will be constructed are of the opinion that they would not be in a position to take care of the situation with respect to furnishing all the services and facilities, the utilities, that would be required by an expanded population.

The point that I had in mind was whether or not, in addition to the authorization of funds that has been mentioned here, has provision been made to take care of that question? I realize that that will depend to a large extent upon exactly where these buildings are constructed, whether within a community or adjacent to a community, or at some other point; and that those points have not yet been selected so that it is difficult to say just what the situation will be.

But in the event that some of these buildings are constructed adjacent to some other communities in outlying districts either in Virginia or Maryland, the question I have in mind is whether or not it would be necessary to have an additional authorization and appropriations by the Government, through some appropriate agencies, to furnish these communities with sufficient funds to provide the facilities needed by an expanded population. Now, that is rather a long question, Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is a long question, and I will try to cover it the best I can. I think the construction of buildings at some distance out from the central portion of Washington would change somewhat the pattern of living. It should not require or call for additional people in the metropolitan area of Washington, because we are planning to replace temporary structures.

Mr. LARCADE. If you will pardon an interruption, I am not referring to Washington. I am referring, for instance, to Virginia—let us say Fairfax, or Arlington, or Maryland, or some point in such vicinities. The question is, if buildings were constructed there, either adjacent to or within a community, would it require additional funds beyond the estimate for the construction of these units that would be covered under this bill?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The point that I was making, to start with, is that we were not increasing, per se, the population of the Federal Government in Washington, simply because we were going to build these buildings. But you do have an impact on the people that live in this other area. That is the point that you are talking to.

I would lean to the position that it is not within the jurisdiction of this committee to solve the question of housing, community facilities, and so forth. Those matters are now being considered by other committees of the Congress, bearing upon the general question throughout the United States of community facilities made necessary by the impact of the defense effort; the question of payment in lieu of taxes; the question of schools that may be required due to the impact of the Federal effort, quite similar to what was carried on during the last war under the terms of the Lanham Act. So that all of those matters, if it can be demonstrated that they have arisen due to the action of the Federal Government, would come under the perview of any legislation that the Congress may enact in connection with those particular items. Does that answer your question, at least in part?

Mr. LARCADE. Not exactly. I was just trying to find out whether or not the appropriation asked for, or the authorization asked for is sufficient to cover the furnishing of these facilities at any point where these buildings are constructed; facilities such as sewage disposal, streets, sewers, schools, electric lights, and other services that may be required?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The funds requested under this authorization would cover only the authority existing in section 1 of the act. It provides for the purchase of a site which would be 200 or 250 or 300 acres, the provision of utilities on that site and the development of a water supply on or contiguous to it, highway construction, and communication systems. It does not involve any jurisdictions beyond that.

Mr. LARCADE. That answers my question.

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask a question at this point? Is not all of the water supply in this immediate part of the country taken from the same source?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; it is not. The city of Washington and some of the surrounding areas and a part of Arlington County are supplied with water from the Potomac River. When you go north, northeast, and southeast, they have other sources of supply, and also farther west they have other sources.

Mr. GEORGE. I was thinking about the question of contamination of water in this dispersal area, which would have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It would have to be, because you have not only the supply of water itself, which is making site selections rather difficult, because in certain areas it is quite inadequate, but also you have the question of sewage disposal so that it will not contaminate the watershed which may now be serving water to some community.

Mr. GEORGE. That is all.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Commissioner, do you not think that you could go 700 or 800 miles away and house more cheaply some of these functions of Government that are not so vitally necessary to be close to Washington, at the same time giving you adequate office space here in this immediate area?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Of course, Mr. Davis, you are asking me to go into fields over which I have no responsibility. But I have been urging that decentralization be carried to the absolute maximum. That is the viewpoint of the Bureau of the Budget. That is the reason for the increase from 8,000 to 25,000 persons. And I made this one stipulation which they agreed to. That was that any move out of Washington to a decentralized area in the United States should be made on a permanent basis, so that we would not go through all of the headaches that we went through during the last war of moving people out and then moving them back in again. That places certain limitations on the number of people that you can take out permanently from Washington. I am sure you are talking about permanent decentralization?

Mr. DAVIS. Permanent; that is correct. That is all.

Mr. SCUDDER. Then this proposal is for housing facilities of certain agencies that are going to be sent out, but it does not represent by any means the limit of Federal funds necessary to provide housing facilities that would go with the program. In other words, there would be a further development through other agencies of the Government that would have to be built up to go along with this program, would there not?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not necessarily. I do know this, that private enterprise is very much interested in developing housing at any sites that we may select, and they would probably do it under certain guaranteed mortgages of the FHA, or something of the sort. I do not know how.

Mr. SCUDDER. It is not anticipated, then, to go into public housing projects around these various locations that are being set up?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is not.

Mr. SCUDDER. I rather like the program of the warehouse type of building, because I do believe that a great number of areas in Wash-

ington are being used for storage purposes that could very well be taken care of outside the city of Washington.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Incidentally—you are from California—I discussed this general question of office space, warehousing, and so forth, with Governor Warren recently when I was in Sacramento. I found, strangely enough, that the State of California is running into exactly the same problem that we are running into. I shall later submit to this committee plans whereby we could go into a lease-purchase arrangement, similar to what the State of California did 2 years ago, to provide facilities for the Federal Government, as they did out in the State of California for State activities.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Reynolds, in the course of your reconsideration—if I may term it such—of the program, since you previously testified in December, you have arrived at the point where you have eliminated two of the original dispersal locations. I understand from what you stated heretofore as well as today that part of your difficulties are encompassed in the necessity for more space, occasioned because of the delapidated condition of the temporary buildings, which have now gotten to the point where they are beyond repair. Am I correct in that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct. We cannot keep them up much longer.

Mr. PICKETT. You are now using, I believe, temporary buildings here to house approximately 48,000 people, as I understood your testimony a while ago?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. PICKETT. And you want to construct, further, permanent accommodations for 30,000?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is right.

Mr. PICKETT. That would leave 18,000, and offhand I do not recall where you have said you were going to put them. Are you going to leave them in the temporary buildings, or where are you going to put them?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No. Let us go back to peacetime and back to the basis upon which we started, of 18,000. You take out 22,000 people who will be permanently dispersed from Washington, or rather decentralized from Washington. Then you can house the permanent establishment of the Government in these six buildings, at 5,000 persons each. That will permit the removal of the temporary buildings.

Mr. PICKETT. Then you are going to take care of all of the 48,000 who are now housed in temporary buildings—30,000 in the permanent dispersal buildings and 22,000 who will be permanently decentralized; is that correct?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is on a permanent basis.

Mr. PICKETT. Yes. But we cannot figure on operating on a permanent basis today, because there are so many temporary agencies that are increasing their payroll now.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is right.

Mr. PICKETT. For instance, the Office of Price Stabilization, and some others. In your program, do you propose to do away with these temporary buildings now being occupied by the 48,000 personnel, or are you going to keep them?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We are going to get rid of the highly inflammable portion of them. The 70,000 deficit that I spoke of awhile

ago, after giving credit to the 22,000 or 25,000, using either figure, for decentralization—we would be required to maintain the Munitions Building, the Navy Building, temporary building E; those are all concrete construction. The rest of them are match boxes.

Mr. PICKETT. And they would be done away with?

Mr. REYNOLDS. They would be done away with.

Mr. PICKETT. With reference to the dispersal program, in that list of positions, I believe Mr. Jones called them this morning, that are going to be sent out to the dispersal area, are you going to send some of the top echelon people out to those areas, or only the lower echelon?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Are you talking about dispersal now or decentralization?

Mr. PICKETT. Dispersal. Let me see if I can make myself clear. Mr. Jones this morning referred to a certain agency and said that there would be 600 positions involved; as to another one, 1,000 positions; as to another one, 1,500; and so forth. They were going to be taken out of Washington. For instance, the Coast and Geodetic Survey was mentioned as one illustration. Are you going to take the whole organization, lock, stock, and barrel, from the administrator on down to the last file clerk or messenger boy, and move them out there, or are you going to leave the administrator and his staff here and take everybody else out?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think, generally speaking—and this is a subject for which I have no responsibility—that wherever possible the top people would go out to these dispersal areas. I can give you an illustration in our own establishment. We do not think that anybody in Public Buildings needs to go. But if it were determined that they should go out, you could follow two courses. One, you could keep the top echelon downtown and the rest would go out. But the people who would go out would be of sufficient experience and stature to be able to carry on that operation, even though the top echelon did not go out. In certain cases that might be a good idea, anyway.

Mr. PICKETT. In the process of protecting the functions of government, I think we have got to recognize that the administrator of a given agency is as essential to the functioning of that agency as any other individual.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think you would have to make that assumption.

Mr. PICKETT. In the protection of the function, would you not necessarily have to carry along the administrator or some of the top-flight people, at least in a large number of instances?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Oh, yes; I see no reason why they should not go.

Mr. PICKETT. If you did not do that, Mr. Reynolds, would you not impair the efficiency of the agency itself through separating its personnel in that way?

Mr. REYNOLDS. You would slow it down somewhat, depending upon the communications system. A lot of the work is now done purely by communications, because in a large agency you can see only a few of your own people even, and you do things mostly by telephone and memorandum.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Reynolds, in a resurvey of your proposition here—I am not going to ask you where they are, because I recognize there are some vital reasons why that information should not be divulged, if the information is known—have you already selected the site areas to which you are going to move?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We have not. We have selected only general areas and have studied each one of those and could make a decision pretty soon on the general question.

Mr. PICKETT. In connection with that, I have the recollection that the Federal Government owns a good many thousand acres of land in the area here, within a reasonable mileage radius, such as is contemplated in this picture; for instance, Greenbelt, Suitland, Belvoir, and so forth; and that there are other pieces of property owned by the Government. Is there any reason in the world why land already owned by the Federal Government cannot be used in this program?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It might be used in part. If you will refer to this map over here, you will see that Beltsville is about 14 miles out. That is indicated in this area right here. This cirle is the 20-mile circle.

This [indicating] is Fort Meade. The 20-mile circle goes right through the center of Fort Meade. When you get down into this area [indicating] you will find that Belvoir is about 13 to 16 miles out. Suitland is very close in. It is not shown on this map, but it is about 3 or 4 miles toward Washington from Andrews Field which, of itself, is only about 12 miles to the center of it.

It is difficult, if you are working on a radius of around 20 miles, to find very much Government-owned land.

Mr. PICKETT. Of course, at places like Fort Meade and Fort Belvoir, and other military installations, they are being used for a specific purpose. I do not know what is the total area of either one of those places. As a practical matter, aren't there a great many acres at such places that are not used at all; that are just out there on the edge of the woods? Would you confirm or refute that impression of mine?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Army representatives are here and they know more about it than I do. I have driven over Fort Meade, somewhat, and somewhat over Belvoir. As a matter of fact, I was located there in the First World War, for a while. I presume that there are areas in there that are not too solidly developed.

Mr. PICKETT. You want anywhere from 200 to 300 acres for each one of these dispersal points?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. PICKETT. The point that I am getting at is this: Those two places, for instance, already have highways leading to them. If there is an adequate acreage of vacant land out there, which does not run right up to the edge of the facilities necessary for the military purposes, why could not one corner of each of those military reservations be lopped off and set aside for the purpose you have in mind, in constructing these dispersal buildings? You already have water facilities there available, of course.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think it would be entirely a question of distance, whether it was out far enough or not.

Mr. PICKETT. You mentioned Meade a while ago.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Meade would be.

Mr. PICKETT. There was discussion in previous hearings about going out as far as 20 miles; about 18 to 24 miles were the figures used.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is right.

Mr. PICKETT. And parts of Belvoir are around 14 or 15 miles out, you say?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I would say about 16 miles to the farthest part; about 12 miles to the nearest part. This is Belvoir [indicating on map].

Mr. PICKETT. We do not have to confine ourselves exactly to a 20-mile radius; we might go 28 miles, might we not?

Mr. REYNOLDS. If we went 28 miles, you would go beyond the areas we discussed and almost to Baltimore. This is 30 miles, which is very close to Baltimore [indicating on map]. With 30 miles, you would just reach Quantico.

Mr. PICKETT. But there are a number of spots within a 30-mile radius where the Federal Government owns land and you would not have to buy the land; it would be just a matter of a transfer between agencies?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It has always been my opinion that if we can possibly find Government-owned land, we should use it. But I am having trouble maintaining myself within a belt around here that would be, say, 5 miles in width [indicating on map].

Mr. PICKETT. Assuming now that we are going to go out and acquire the land by purchase, condemnation, transfer, or otherwise, we have arrived at the point in the District of Columbia where it is not feasible either for temporary or long-range purposes to construct many more, if any, permanent buildings; is that right?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is right.

Mr. PICKETT. I believe we agreed on that in previous hearings.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. PICKETT. In your resurvey, have you got any further toward a definite conclusion on what you propose to do with the land already owned in the District of Columbia that is unoccupied by Federal buildings at this time; as to whether we are going to keep it or whether we might dispose of it?

Mr. REYNOLDS. There are quite a number of pieces of property which the Government owns which were bought years ago, from time to time, under legislation that was approved by this committee, within so-called areas of taking. I find, in trying to dispose of some of these, that I have to get some legislation in order to handle it and I am very anxious to get that legislation. That is one of the pieces of legislation I will have before this committee. But to the extent possible, if you establish a program here whereby the permanent buildings will be in a dispersed area, regardless of distance, then quite a few holdings in Washington should be disposed of. In a great many cases they are just single lots or two or three houses or four or five houses in a row.

Mr. PICKETT. To say the least, there is not any resistance either on your part or the people you represent to disposing of what I am going to call excessive Government-owned land in the District of Columbia?

Mr. REYNOLDS. None whatever.

Mr. PICKETT. Do you know of any other agency of the Government that would object to it at the present time?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not know of any.

Mr. PICKETT. I just want to offer you my cooperation now in getting that legislation passed in a hurry.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Thank you.

Mr. PICKETT. This question comes up now in connection with what Mr. Larcade mentioned a moment ago, in reference to providing facilities such as communications and utilities, to people who are going to work at these dispersed locations. You propose to take or acquire 200 or 300 acres of land for each site on which you are going to construct necessary water facilities, and so forth. Is the plan developed to the point where in providing for water and sewage disposal and other essentials, you could accommodate any of the residential construction that might probably follow?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We have talked with some of the people who have jurisdiction in these adjacent counties as to how we could combine forces in developing, for instance, the extension of a water main, the extension of a sewer line, or something of that sort. And my thinking all along has been that if we can do that, and it would not cost us any more money than if we provided the facilities ourselves which we would have to provide for taking care of the people who work in these Government buildings—that if we could do that, that would be the proper way to handle the question.

Mr. PICKETT. Rather than to construct your own water works?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The same thing with sewage disposal and things of that sort.

Mr. PICKETT. In talking to these people, do they indicate to you whether they are going to come back here to this or some other committee and ask for an authorization and an appropriation to help them provide those things that you are going to have to get or that will naturally be required following the construction of your facilities?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; the testimony before the Senate committee, where the county supervisors testified, and some of the planning groups, was that the primary question that gave them concern was schools. That, as I indicated a while ago, is a question of jurisdiction of other committees of Congress and should not be a part of this legislation, because similar legislation may arise in the Congress concerning other locations throughout the United States that will have the same problem.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Have you any questions, Mr. Lanham?

Mr. LANHAM. No questions.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. George?

Mr. GEORGE. No questions.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Bray?

Mr. BRAY. No questions.

Mr. PICKETT. May I ask one more question, Mr. Chairman? This thought occurred to me in connection with your second sentence of your proposed amendment. As I caught it, it would authorize your agency to condemn structures that are already in the process of completion or being completed in order to utilize part of the funds authorized, and convert them into office space; is that right?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It would not.

Mr. PICKETT. It would only authorize you to construct such additional temporary structures as you might find necessary at these permanent locations?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We would prefer to call them semifinished buildings. I definitely will never recommend to anybody that we build a temporary building for any use from now on out.

Mr. PICKETT. But it would not give you any additional power, it would not specifically include any power—that is, this amendment—to go down and take some of these apartment buildings, for instance?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It would not.

Mr. PICKETT. You do not contemplate that?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No.

Mr. SCUDDER. One question, please. In your investigation of possible sites that you have mentioned, you no doubt have information as to what the value of the land would be that you would have to acquire. I just visualize, traveling about the country, that some farm site might be a suitable site for this kind of installation and would not be too excessive in price. What would be the average price per acre of the land that you would probably acquire?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Land here is not too expensive unless you are buying a dairy farm, or something of that sort.

Mr. SCUDDER. Even a dairy farm would not be very expensive.

Mr. REYNOLDS. It is not expensive.

Mr. SCUDDER. Have you any idea what the value of this land would be?

Mr. REYNOLDS. It runs from $100 to $300 an acre.

Mr. SCUDDER. Then it would not be a very great amount that would be involved in the over-all land cost?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; it would be an insignificant portion of the over-all cost.

Mr. LARCADE. I would like to ask Mr. Reynolds to comment on an article which I have before me. I do not know whether you have read it. It appeared in one of the Washington newspapers and the title of it is, "Dispersed Persons Unlikely To Trail Dispersed Jobs." The article goes on to say that with reference to some of the bureaus about to be decentralized, employees who were queried with regard to the matter in some units declined at a rate as high as 90 percent or more. I was wondering what impact that would have on those people who have homes in Washington and whose units were going to be transferred to some other community.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Our experience during the last war was that in the case of decentralization as opposed to dispersal, from 30 to 60 percent of the people moved with the agency. It depends upon its type. Regulatory agencies, such as the SEC, which was moved to Philadelphia, carried a considerably higher number of its people than some other agency that would have a higher proportion of low-salaried help, such as stenographers and typists and so forth.

My own personal hope would be this: That if you moved an agency, say, to Kansas, as few would go as could carry on the business and have the recruitment done locally. That then reduces the impact on the housing situation of the community to which you would go. It also keeps those people here who could be immediately converted to work in the defense departments and control agencies. They then would not have to be brought in from the outside to Washington. However, the key people, the responsible people in any of the agencies or portions thereof, that are decentralized, should go with the agency. And I think perhaps a higher percentage will go now than went during the last war, because this is a permanent move rather than a temporary one.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Are there any further questions? If not, have you any further witnesses, Mr. Reynolds, on this subject, for the Government?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think that is all, Mr. Chairman, at the moment. There were other people who testified at the previous hearing; Mr. Nolen was here from the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Our clerk tells me that Mr. Nolen cannot be here until morning. We wanted to complete the testimony of those witnesses from the Government who were here and tomorrow we will take up other witnesses who may want to testify. If there are no other witnesses here now to be heard, from the Government, the committee will adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 3:35 p. m., the subcommittee adjourned, to meet on Tuesday, February 6, 1951, at 10 a. m.)

# DISPERSAL OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1951**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
*Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met at 10 a. m., Hon. James W. Trimble (chairman) presiding.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The subcommittee will be in order. The first witness this morning is Mr. John Nolen, Jr., representing the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. In view of the fact that the Commission has filed a report, I think it advisable to insert the report in the record before Mr. Nolen testifies.

(The report referred to is as follows:)

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION,
*Washington, D. C., January 31, 1951.*

Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works,*
*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. BUCKLEY: In accordance with your request of January 22, 1951, for the views of this Commission on H. R. 1728, to authorize a program to provide for the construction of Federal buildings outside of and accessible to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission submits the following report and recommendation.

The Commission endorses this legislation with amendment and urges its immediate passage for two fundamental reasons:

(1) It appears to be essential in the interest of the defense of the seat of government and of a better arrangement of Government facilities concentrated in the Washington area.

(2) It will permit the solution of an expanding office problem in accordance with sound principles of comprehensive city and regional planning, as set forth in the recent report of the Commission entitled "Washington: Present and Future." Your attention is particularly called to the recommendations on pages 10 and 47 of the attached copy thereof.

In order that the basic purposes of the dispersal plan may be brought about, it is necessary to have coordinate planning of Federal and local development related to the dispersed Federal buildings, especially when these are located so far beyond the fringe of the present urbanizing area. Unless a regional plan is prepared in harmony with the objectives of the Federal Government under this program and such regional plan is made effective by coordinate local plans, then the advantages and protection expected by dispersal may well be greatly diminished or offset by subsequent adverse conditions.

The Commission is responsible under the law for preparing and keeping up to date a comprehensive plan for the National Capital and environs. Consequently, it feels very keenly that its regional planning must be expanded in cooperation with both Federal and local planning agencies if the above adverse trends are to be avoided. The Commission therefore recommends that H. R. 1728 be amended to provide—

(1) That the Administrator of General Services be authorized and directed to utilize the services of the Commission for such regional planning as may be desirable to effectuate and preserve the purposes of the dispersal program, and pay the cost thereof.

(2) That the Commission be authorized to advance and contribute funds to local planning agencies to expedite and secure the preparation and adoption of local plans and regulations that will protect and assure the objectives of the dispersal program.

The enclosed recommended draft of the proposed amendment to H. R. 1728 is a revision and simplification of that which the Commission proposed for H. R. 9864 of the Eighty-first Congress. It is required because, although a Federal agency, the Commission is supported by District of Columbia appropriations and could not very well use its small existing staff thus financed on problems so far beyond the District boundary. Federal funds would be necessary to augment or reimburse the Commission for additional services which the Administrator of General Services has advised the Commission he would ask it to perform.

Other Federal legislation, either existing or proposed, does not seem applicable to the peculiar legal status of the Commission, nor to the need for aiding local community planning. Furthermore, it is unlikely that separate legislation could be secured in time to be effective in the early stages of the dispersal program when it is most needed.

Time has not permitted the clearance of this report and of the proposed amendment with the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

CONRAD L. WIRTH,
*Acting Executive Officer.*

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION DRAFT OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF S. 218

Add at the end of section 1, page 2, line 22, a new sentence to read as follows: "The Administrator is authorized and directed to utilize the services of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for such regional planning as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, and shall advance funds to, or reimburse, said Commission for the cost of such services, including any advances or reimbursements made by said Commission to local planning agencies for the making of coordinate local plans."

## STATEMENT OF JOHN NOLEN, JR., DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Nolen, you may state your name for the record.

Mr. NOLEN. John Nolen, Jr., Director of Planning, National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Proceed and make your statement in your own way; and, after you have finished, the committee may want to ask you some questions.

Mr. NOLEN. As you have indicated, Mr. Chairman, the Commission has filed a report at the request of the committee. The report submits a brief amendment to the legislation which is designed to permit the Commission to participate in the planning that it visualizes will be necessary in connection with this dispersal program.

We have discussed this need for regional planning with the Administrator, Mr. Larson, on a number of occasions, and so far as we can ascertain we are in agreement as to the need and the desirability of the Commission, in carrying out its authorized functions for planning in the Washington area, to undertake to do that work in cooperation with the General Services Administration. The purpose of the amendment is to permit that cooperation.

The reason for it is that under existing legislation the Commission's activities have heretofore been restricted to the immediate environs of Washington. I think that most members of the committee have received a copy of our recent report on the comprehensive plan, and you will recall that the fold-in map in the back of the report covers

an area about 15 miles out from Washington, in some directions perhaps 20 miles.

We feel very definitely that to jump over a rather considerable area out to the 20-mile limit will call for some extension of the Commission's plans. It is more than what we have heretofore called "the environs," and our law limits us to planning for the National Capital and its environs.

We thought it seemed rather plain that it would be foolish not to extend our planning activity to the reorientation of the Government establishment in the Washington area under this new 20-mile dispersal plan.

The other difficulty is that the Commission is financed with District of Columbia funds. The budget for our planning staff is included in the District appropriation and it is about 90 percent paid for from District revenues. We did not feel that, while the Commissioners have been very liberal about our planning activity in the immediate environs, we could go out 20 miles and spend District funds for activities that far out. That is not quite what we were authorized to do. And so that is the purpose of this amendment: to accomplish those two things; to make clear that the Commission is authorized to extend its regional planning activities to this new radius and to permit it to receive Federal funds to work cooperatively with the Administrator on the larger planning problems that the dispersal program will create.

Mr. McGregor. Do I understand that under the existing law you have no authority to participate in the planning program contemplated in the matter before us?

Mr. Nolen. That is the way we felt. It was too far out.

Mr. McGregor. And in your amendment you are asking for legislation that would give you jurisdiction in this 20-mile radius?

Mr. Nolen. Only insofar as we have it now with respect to Federal projects. Of course, it is very evident that even the Congress cannot grant us any authority to do anything in the adjoining States that is not provided for in State legislation. For example, we have in the State of Maryland the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and there is a clause in their legislation that permits them to cooperate with our Commission. It is the agency of the State of Maryland authorized to cooperate with the Federal Government.

Mr. McGregor. Do you not think that you are going just a little far afield from the original purpose of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission when you ask this committee for legislation at the Federal level that would give you permission to go into Maryland or into any other State—maybe into Ohio; you might decide that you would want to go out into Ohio? Do you not think you are infringing on States' rights there?

Mr. Nolen. No, sir; that is my very point. There is not the slightest possibility of our infringing on States' rights. Those rights are guaranteed to the States, and all that the Congress can do is to permit a Federal agency to work with a State or with a local agency.

Mr. McGregor. Here we are being asked to establish another Federal agency which will make for more red tape for that local agency or any other agency to put through its program.

Mr. NOLEN. No, sir; no more than the dispersal program itself infringes upon the rights or the freedom of adjoining States. This simply covers Federal activities in planning in the neighborhood of Washington and authorizes the Commission to be the coordinating body for the coordination of Federal and local activities. We already have laws to do that. The existing law permits our Commission to do that in cooperation with agencies designated by the State of Maryland for that purpose. The State of Maryland has designated in its case the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission as the agency of the State to deal with our Commission as the representative of the Federal Government. There is not any infringement. You could not infringe upon any State's rights; the Congress does not have the ability to infringe.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You are asking authority that you shall be called in on any conference about a contemplated project; is not that true?

Mr. NOLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCGREGOR. In other words, we are just adding another person to the table.

Mr. NOLEN. No; Mr. Larsen has said from the very beginning that he expected to call upon our Commission to cooperate with the General Services Administration on such regional planning as this program would require. We have construed our existing law to inhibit us from doing the very thing that he has said he would like to have us do, for the two reasons that I first mentioned: (1) That the distance out is somewhat beyond that in which we have been accustomed to work, and (2) we are financed with District of Columbia funds, and it did not seem fair to take District funds and use them to work on a program 20 miles out. And yet the Congress created this Commission 25 years ago to make a plan for the National Capital and its environs. And if we are to participate in this new program we feel that this brief amendment is necessary.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Nolen, do you have the amendment drawn?

Mr. NOLEN. Yes, sir; I wonder if it would not be well for me to read it as this time?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I suggest that you read it.

Mr. NOLEN. Add at the end of section 1, page 2, line 22, a new sentence to read as follows:

> The Administrator is authorized and directed to utilize the services of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for such regional planning as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, and shall advance funds to, or reimburse, said Commission for the cost of such services, including any advances or reimbursements made by said Commission to local planning agencies for the making of coordinate local plans.

That last provision we have discussed with the local planning agencies in the Washington area over a period of some months, for they have indicated to us that they are quite concerned about the problems that will be laid on their doorstep.

Mr. Larsen and our Commission both felt that the basic problems of planning control are for the local jurisdictions to carry out and to solve. All that we have proposed to do would be to coordinate Federal activities with these local jurisdictions and assist them in any proper way, in any way that they might wish, to make their own coordinate local plans.

They undoubtedly are going to have some large problems to deal with. They have the existing organization for planning to do that.

Most of the counties surrounding Washington, and the municipalities, have existing planning organizations.

Whther they are equipped to meet the new problems that will be brought to them by the dispersal program is a good deal of a question. It depends on where these projects are located. But we feel that with an amendment such as this, which will make available the experience of our Commission, gained during 25 years of dealing with Federal problems and their impact upon local communities, and with the ability to extend moderate financial assistance to these local communities, we can solve these problems and make the dispersal program work.

Otherwise, the basic purpose of spreading things out and securing relief from congestion and vulnerability from attack may well be vitiated by adverse developments that proper planning could prevent.

I would like to point this up about the dispersal program. It has been coming for a long time. This report that I referred to details the Commission's recommendations for the accommodation of the future development of the Federal Government, which is the basic industry in this area. One out of three persons employed is employed by the Federal Government. One out of seven persons in the area is employed by the Federal Government.

Our basic plan for the location of Federal employment is shown here [indicating] in this diagram, and it is well adapted for expansion, for "a loosening up" in accordance with the 20-mile-radius provision of the dispersal plan.

Actually, dispersion has been going on for many years. These two diagrams show the location of Federal employment as of the postwar period.

Mr. BRAY. What page is that?

Mr. NOLEN. That is on page 11 of the report. The top diagram shows a rather considerable amount of close-in dispersion, out from what we have heretofore called the central area.

Up until about the middle of 1935, practically all employment of the Federal Government was concentrated downtown in Washington, with a few minor exceptions, like the Bureau of Standards, Walter Reed Hospital, and so forth. Then there began the relocation of certain activities, mostly scientific and research functions, like the moving of the old agricultural experimental farm from Arlington out to Beltsville; the naval hospital from near the Lincoln Memorial to Bethesda. The Census Bureau, which used to be downtown, was moved to Suitland.

And so, with the war, there came further "decentralization," as we then called it; now designated "dispersion" or "dispersal." Our basic plan here is an extension of that principle.

There were many good, sound reasons for it. I think the chief one that gains popular support is the relief of congestion downtown. The Federal Government has piled up and piled up its establishment in the central area and has created the problem that everybody complains about; and yet it has left it to the municipality to solve the problem very largely. The point has now been reached, with the saturated traffic, parking and transportation conditions downtown, that it does not make sense to bring more people into the central area.

Now along comes the problem of defense and a new principle that has to be observed for the protection of the Federal establishment, and

it happens that it coincides with a sound planning principle for the location of the Federal establishment. So, the two plans work in nicely together.

We feel that we should be allowed to proceed with the joint planning of this program and the other activities of the Federal Government that will be inevitably concerned, and the coordination of those activities with the plans of the local communities which will have control over the development that will follow on the decisions made for each dispersal building.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that is the substance of what I wanted to say.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Nolen, as I get the import of your testimony, it is this: You feel that even if the matter of national defense were not involved, you favor dispersal, because of the problem of the congestion of traffic which exists in the District?

Mr. NOLEN. Yes, and for other sound planning reasons.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Nolen, perhaps I did not catch the entire import of your suggestion, but I got the impression from what you said that you think the National Capital Park and Planning Commission ought to have a great deal to say about what is done; am I correct in that?

Mr. NOLEN. Yes, but only within the limits of our existing authority.

Mr. PICKETT. You do not want to broaden your authority at all?

Mr. NOLEN. No, sir; only geographically.

Mr. PICKETT. How much of the territory between the 20-mile limit that we are talking about for dispersal locations and the present geographical limits of your authority do you want to include—all of it?

Mr. NOLEN. I would say that there is an intervening area there of about 5 miles, that is all. I indicated that already our plan extends out about 15 miles.

Mr. PICKETT. You already have an area of approximately 10 miles, is that right?

Mr. NOLEN. Intensively planned; yes. Actually we extend about 15 miles.

Mr. PICKETT. Whether location X is 15 or 25 miles from mile point zero, you want your authority to extend over the intervening territory all the way to the dispersal point; is that what you have in mind?

Mr. NOLEN. We would feel so, yes; if we are to be responsible, as we have been for 25 years, for the planning of the National Capital and its environs, then it seems only reasonable that we should be allowed to work on this program with the General Services Administration and the other Federal agencies which will be involved.

Mr. PICKETT. Suppose that some point were selected 30 miles away. Would you want your authority to be extended to cover the territory for that distance, too?

Mr. NOLEN. In a somewhat diluted way; yes.

Mr. PICKETT. In other words, the concentration of your authority is controlled by the distance involved; is that what you have in mind?

Mr. NOLEN. Yes; the further you go out, the less interest there is; that is, the less impact on Washington.

Mr. PICKETT. Thank you.

Mr. BRAY. You have that authority now under the law, do you not?

Mr. NOLEN. Our so-called authority is advisory only.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Larsen, the head of General Services, may call on you for anything he wants from you, may he not?

Mr. NOLEN. One Federal agency, yes, can call on another body for any appropriate service.

Mr. BRAY. Under the proposal you have submitted, he would be compelled to call upon you, whether he wanted to or not; is that correct?

Mr. NOLEN. On the other hand, we could not be called upon to make a plan for the Fiji Islands if Mr. Larsen had to have a plan for those islands.

Mr. BRAY. Of course, I do not know how far you want your authority expanded. But Mr. Larsen does have the authority now to call upon you for help in this territory within 10 or 15 or 25 miles, anyway. What is the necessity of creating more law on the subject when he already has that right to call upon you for any help that you might be able to give him? You would not want to force your help on him if he does not want it, would you?

Mr. NOLEN. That is right, but we are limited in our statute to making plans for the National Capital and its environs.

Mr. BRAY. You would certainly call these the environs, if they started dispersing these units around there?

Mr. NOLEN. That would be the end result, to be sure.

Mr. BRAY. That is what I thought.

Mr. NOLEN. But we are supported by District of Columbia funds and I am sure that we would hear from our friends in the District if we started spending those funds on problems 20 miles out.

Mr. BRAY. So that the question of funds is the main question. I could not quite figure out why you wanted more law; it is to get the money?

Mr. NOLEN. Not to get more money alone, but to be allowed to do the job that the Administrator wants us to do.

Mr. TRIMBLE. There are no further questions, thank you, Mr. Nolen. The next witness on our calendar is Mr. Fred W. Tuemmler, Director of Planning, National Capital Park and Planning Commission of Maryland.

(Mr. Tuemmler did not come forward.)

Mr. TRIMBLE. If Mr. Blair Lee is present, we should be glad to hear him at this time.

## STATEMENT OF BLAIR LEE, CONSULTANT, MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. LEE. My name is Blair Lee. I was Vice Chairman of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission up until about a month ago when I resigned and I am now a special consultant to the Commission on a number of specific problems, the main one of which is this dispersal business.

The Maryland commission is the planning commission established by law covering an area of about 320 square miles in the Maryland suburbs of Washington, in both Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties. It takes in part but not all of the 20-mile radius in Maryland. There are some parts of those two counties that are not in any planning commission area and one part that is in an area covered by the Upper Montgomery County Planning Commission.

Whether a site will be selected in our commission's area or not is something that I do not know at this point. Certainly we will be very radically affected by whatever does come. The highways that Mr. Reynolds and Colonel Potts were discussing yesterday will go through our area, especially if Colonel Potts gets the circumferential ring highway that he was talking about yesterday, 10 or 12 miles outside of the center of Washington, that will carve its way entirely through our district, so we are, needless to say, intensely interested in that entire problem.

Last December, when this issue was before you in an earlier bill, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission had an amendment to it which was substantially the same as the one which Mr. Nolen read you a few minutes ago. In fact, it was a little stronger, if anything.

When our commission met last Thursday on this subject, we did not know whether the National Commission was going to come up with a similar amendment again or not, but using the old December one as the basis of our discussion, our commission adopted a resolution strongly endorsing the National Commission's proposal and urging you gentlemen to incorporate it into the language of the act itself.

I would like you to understand our reasoning for it, because as you well know, there are probably—I will not say no States, but Maryland and Virginia are certainly States that are traditionally and notoriously jealous of their States' rights and we do not ask for Federal intervention on any subject except when we feel that we really need it.

In this particular case we do feel that we need it. What we are up against is the fact that there are four or five counties and several independent cities in the Maryland-Virginia suburbs of Washington, each of which has its own local government, its own planning commission. There are at least seven local planning commissions in Virginia, in the suburbs and there are two in Maryland. There is the Upper Montgomery Planning Commission and then there is the area in the outer reaches of Prince Georges County which has no commission at all.

So there you see a whole welter of small local planning commissions trying to do business separately with the General Services Administration and our feeling is that we would very much want to hang together rather than hang separately. We feel that the best method we can select to do that is to work through the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

We have worked with that Commission for a great many years already. They know the lay of the land out in the suburbs. They are familiar with us and they are sympathetic to us.

The proposal evidently has no objection from the General Services people. I read in the papers that Mr. Larsen attended the meeting of the National Commission about 10 days ago and told them that he intended to use the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as a central clearinghouse for regional planning that was involved in this dispersal plan. Our feeling is that Mr. Larsen is undoubtedly a man of his word, but we would like to see it in writing. We are country folks and we would like to see it in the bill, in writing. And if Mr. Larsen says that he plans to use the National Capital Commission and has no objection, then certainly he cannot have any reasonable objection to seeing it in the bill.

I do not know yet whether this National Commission amendment is going to be or whether it has been endorsed by the Budget Bureau. But with or without such endorsement we most earnestly ask you gentlemen to protect us by putting it in the bill.

While I am up here, I would like to take a few minutes to speak to a couple of points that were raised yesterday by you gentlemen as to what you might call your future relations with the suburbs if this dispersal plan goes through.

I remember particularly that yesterday Mr. Larcade and Mr. Pickett brought up the question of whether or not, in the event that the dispersal plan goes through as outlined by Mr. Reynolds, the suburbs will then be coming back to you over and over again for more financial help for schools and recreation and every other kind of thing.

Now, that is not a very easy question to answer, frankly, as it involves the complicated background of these areas that we live in in the Washington suburbs.

With us, the Federal Government is the same as the automobile manufacturer is in the city of Detroit. The Government is our main industry. It certainly brings a lot of people into our area, a lot of new houses, which, in turn, are followed by stores, all of which go on our tax base. In that respect we are the same as Detroit, but in one other very important respect we are entirely different from Detroit, because out there, the main industry itself, the automobile-manufacturing industry, is part of the tax base. In these counties around Washington and in the city itself, the main industry, the Government, is exempt. It is not in the tax base.

Montgomery County, where I live, is strictly a bedroom county. It has miles and miles of houses, a few stores, but nothing that could really be described as industry. There are a few stray little precision instrument factories, but nothing that is industry in the sense that you know of it.

In addition to that, the Montgomery County government, the department of finance, has made a study of the residential element of the county with reference to the tax base and they have established beyond the question of a doubt that 95 percent of the homes in the county constitute a drain on the county treasury. In other words, they pay less in taxes, although the tax rate is quite high, than they cost in services. The difference is made up, of course, from the tax on commercial properties, the small industry that exists and the vacant land.

What I am getting at is this, that if this program causes 5,000 or 10,000 new, medium-priced houses to be built in Montgomery County or in Prince Georges County or Fairfax, or any of them, they are not doing the county in question any good financially. That is the plain truth of the matter.

Well, then, you may ask, are you for this dispersal program or are you against it? And I would say, in all honesty, that we have to say we are for it, for various reasons. Witnesses yesterday from the Army and elsewhere said that it was a matter of national safety and continuity of Government, and so forth. That is as may be. I am not an authority on that subject. I am a little inclined to go along with Congressman Davis in his analysis of it, that it is primarily an acute need for new space, for Government buildings.

There is no question in the world that if the Government allows more Federal buildings to be built here in the middle of Washington, this city is just not going to be fit to live in or work in. If they are going to come at all, they have got to go out into the suburbs. We who live out there and always have lived out there and will continue to live there naturally have an interest in the main city itself. We have to come downtown all the time for one reason or another and we do not want it to be choked to death with traffic, which it is in a good way of being right now.

So, if dispersal is the price of safe and orderly expansion of the Government, then we will pay that price cheerfully. But I do want to impress you with the fact that when we say we are for the program, it is not a chamber of commerce proposition, such as the one described yesterday by Mr. Pickett. We are not in here asking for it. We will take it cheerfully, but it is not going to do us much good.

But we will feel a lot better about it if we have some assurance that the impact of it will be guided and controlled to a limited extent by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and by ourselves as people who have been working on the planning of these suburban areas for a great many years. I think that is a reasonable request.

We do not ask that either the National Commission or any of the local commissions be given any kind of a veto power over the General Services Administration. Obviously in a program like this some agency has got to have the final word, has got to be able to move in. You cannot have a whole room full of them sitting there, spitting at each other, and just blocking all progress. We do not want that. But we just want to make it plain in the bill itself that it is the intent of the Congress that the General Services Administration, in handling the program, shall consult the National Commission and shall consult us through the National Commission.

That is about all I have to say, gentlemen, unless you have some questions.

Mr. McGregor. You are consultant to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Is that Commission recognized under the State laws of Maryland?

Mr. Lee. Mr. McGregor, that Commission is set up by Maryland State law and the members of it are appointed by the Governor of Maryland.

Mr. McGregor. Does it cover the whole State of Maryland?

Mr. Lee. No, sir; it covers only this area of about 320 square miles in the immediate suburbs of Washington, in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties.

Mr. McGregor. I can understand why you should be represented in connection with settling a lot of the problems in your area or jurisdiction, but I cannot understand the necessity of having the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in on this. I think certainly you have the ability, the people who are chosen by the Governor of Maryland must have the ability to determine what Maryland wants without joining hands and seeking authority for the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to cover part of the State of Maryland.

Mr. Lee. Here is what we are up against, Mr. McGregor. There is our Commission and there is the Upper Montgomery Park and

Planning Commission, which is outside of our area. There is the Arlington County Planning Commission; the Fairfax County Commission; the Alexandria City Planning Commission; the Falls Church Planning Commission; Loudon County, Price William County, and the town of Manassas. Each one of them has its own planning commission and each one of them in turn is going to knock on the door of the General Services Administration, and in that case, none of us is going to get very far, it seems to us.

Mr. McGREGOR. You mean that you are getting together and asking some Federal agency to come in and dictate to you? Is that your story?

Mr. LEE. We are not asking to be dictated to.

Mr. McGREGOR. Well, you are asking somebody to come in and act as an arbitrator, then?

Mr. LEE. Well, "arbitration" is a better word. I think we will get friendly and sympathetic help from the National Commission, and we would like to use them as a sort of a clearing house in dealing with the General Services Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, and any other agency that might be involved in this. There are quite a few Federal agencies that are going to be mixed up in this thing and I think that it will simplify, rather than confuse, the whole business if all of the local planning agencies can have one central agency here in Washington in the Federal level through which we can work.

We do not ask to be dictated to, but we would expect and we would like to be allowed to work through that Commission and we would like to make certain that the Federal construction agencies will recognize the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and will recognize us through that Commission.

Mr. McGREGOR. Perhaps I did not understand your statement relative to the question of the expenses that would be involved in the matter of installation of facilities. You have told us about the Maryland Commission and I take it for granted that that commission has given some consideration and thought and perhaps some discussion to the question whether or not you are going to be able to assume that additional load necessary in the installation of facilities; the impact upon your schools, and so forth. Is that correct?

Mr. LEE. There has been a lot of thought given to it. Mr. Reynolds said yesterday that quite a few of those aspects will be considered in other legislation before the Congress. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Reynolds that the question of schools and other needs that will sort of trail along in the wake of the dispersal plan should not be brought in to clutter up this bill.

I do not know whether this area around Washington will be adequately served by legislation of the type that he was mentioning yesterday. You know all of the proposals about payments in lieu of taxes, and school aid where there are very large Federal installations, and things of that sort. Whether that will get us out of the woods or not, I cannot tell at this point.

Mr. McGREGOR. I recognize that probably it is a subject that is muddying the waters or would muddy the waters of the matter under discussion, but after all, this committee wants to protect itself and wants to know whether or not the people you represent are going to come in later and ask the Congress for additional money for exten-

sion of sewers, building of schoolhouses—although sewers and schoolhouses are not mentioned in this bill. Roads are mentioned. Have you discussed the possibility of your State being required to change road alinements and extend its road program?

Mr. LEE. As a matter of fact, the appropriation for roads that would be authorized in this bill is perhaps the one consoling and compensating factor in this that we really like. I am sure that most of you have at some time or other undertaken to drive around the suburbs of Washington from time to time and you know without my telling you what a gruesome experience it is. The roads around Washington are pitifully inadequate and the Maryland and Virginia Highway Commissions aided by the normal Federal aid are doing the best they can to straighten them out. Then there have been instances of direct Federal aid such as in parts of the Shirley Highway. Presumably this program will give a great impetus to that improvement. Part of the road money will go presumably into highways that have already been planned, such as the one between Washington and Frederick.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think what you say is true concerning main arterial highways, but as to feeder or access roads to these highways, I doubt whether or not the Federal Government would enter into an agreement to participate in the building of a complete and broad system of access roads, that would fall directly upon the State of Maryland. Has the Park and Planning Commission taken into consideration that question, as to whether or not they will take care of all of these items or whether they are going to ask Congress for appropriations for access or broader highways?

Mr. LEE. As I understand the program, it is a matter of specifying primarily what you mean by access roads. Assume that you have one of these dispersal points a mile and a half off a main express highway. Certainly the access road leading directly to the Federal plant will be a matter for Mr. Reynolds and Mr. McDonald and the other Federal people to take care of; would you not agree to that—that is, the direct access from the main road?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Within certain limits; yes. But we certainly cannot go into some of the towns in the area which might be considered and take care of a bottleneck in the road structure. We could not be expected to take care of all streets that might lead to main roads.

Mr. LEE. No; that will be up to us and I think we can handle it. There is a certain volume of work that has to be done in any event and the aid that we will get on the main arterial highways through this will I think be sufficient to make it possible for us to take care of the smaller ones of the type that you mentioned.

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is all.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make an observation. The agency represented by the gentleman testifying, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, has submitted to the committee resolutions in which are incorporated certain amendments to the bill under consideration.

It seems to me that rather than have the amendments that are submitted in order to protect the various communities in the area under discussion, that it would be proper to have a substitute amendment to provide that various communities that are involved shall be consulted and shall be called upon to cooperate with the General Services Administration, or whatever administrative agency will be handling the program.

In other words, I can well understand that various communities where these projects would be located should be consulted, should have something to say and have the opportunity to cooperate with the agency that is constructing these projects in the various communities. It would affect their tax structure and there are other questions that must be taken into consideration.

It would appear from the language of the bill that the Administrator is authorized to provide such things as roads, highway bridges, communications, and other facilities that may be necessary and appropriate. However, in the location not only of the project, but in the location of the roads, I think that it would be proper for the Administrator to consult and cooperate with the communities where these projects are to be located. That is all.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Without objection, the resolution of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
RESOLUTION

Whereas there is now under consideration by the Congress of the United States a bill (S. 218) (H. R. 1728) to authorize a program to provide for the construction of Federal buildings outside of, but in the vicinity of and accessible to, the District of Columbia and for other purposes; and

Whereas the proposed bill appears to be an essential measure to provide for Federal building in dispersed areas to permit continuity of important governmental functions in case of an attack on the Nation's Capital; and

Whereas the said bill provides not only for acquisition of sites by the Administrator of General Services but for appurtenant and accessory facilities, such as utilities, roads, highways, bridges, and other off-site facilities, as may be necessary and authorizes the Administrator of General Services to enter into contracts with State and local bodies for such purposes and to such extent as he may find to be in the public interest; and

Whereas one of the stated policies of the bill is to provide "for the sound development of the District of Columbia and its adjacent areas"; and

Whereas any program for dispersal will necessitate the immediate and rapid extension of plans to guide the development of the outlying areas and will require coordination and integration of proposed new facilities with others existing and presently planned in the area, including highways, utilities, and other public facilities and services; and

Whereas the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, a bi-county agency of the State of Maryland, is authorized by chapter 992 of the Laws of Maryland, 1943, and amendments thereto, to make and adopt and, from time to time, amend, extend, and add to a general plan for the physical development of the Maryland-Washington regional district, embracing some 320 square miles of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Md., adjacent to the District of Columbia; and

Whereas, this general plan is for the purposes of guiding and accomplishing the coordinated, comprehensive, and systematic development of the said regional district and the coordination with public and private development of other parts of the State of Maryland and that of the District of Columbia; and

Whereas the Commission is authorized to act in conjunction and cooperation with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, is designated by the State of Maryland as its representative, and is empowered to act in conjunction and cooperation with other representatives or officers of the United States Government; and

Whereas, the Maryland Commission is further authorized and empowered to exercise any of its functions in portions of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties outside the said Maryland-Washington regional district upon the request of the governmental agency having jurisdiction over the area; Now, Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission hereby endorses in principle the said dispersal bill, since it appears to be essential

in the interest of defense of the Seat of Government and the vital functions thereof concentrated in the Washington area; and be it further

*Resolved*, That, for the purpose of carrying out the intent of Congress in the provision for sound development of the District of Columbia and its adjacent areas, an amendment be inserted in the said bill to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) To designate the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as a central planning agency for Federal operations and for the coordination of Federal plans with local plans;

(2) To allocate, from the funds appropriated for the purposes of the said bill, a reasonable allotment to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for the purpose of extending its studies in the dispersal area and surrounding communities; and

(3) To make provision for the reallocation by the said National Commission to local planning agencies of such funds as may be required to assure and expedite local planning coordination with the dispersal program; and

*Be it further resolved*, That this resolution be transmitted to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Works and to the chairman and members of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Buildings; to the chairman of the House Committee on Public Works and to the chairman and members of the House Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds; to the Honorable Herbert R. O'Conor and the Honorable John Marshall Butler, Senators from the State of Maryland; to the Honorable Harry Flood Byrd and the Honorable A. Willis Robertson, Senators from the Commonwealth of Virginia; to the Honorable Lansdale G. Sasscer, Representative from the Fifth District of Maryland, and the Honorable J. Glenn Beall, Representative from the Sixth District of Maryland; to the Honorable Howard W. Smith, Representative from the Eighth District of Virginia; to the Administrator of General Services; to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission; to the county commissioners of Prince George's County, Md., and the County Council of Montgomery County, Md.; and to the Upper Montgomery County Planning Commission, the Northern Virginia Planning and Economic Development Commission, the Arlington County Planning Commission, the Fairfax County Planning Commission, the Falls Church Planning Commission, and the city of Alexandria Planning Commission.

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK
AND PLANNING COMMISSION,
IRWIN I. MAIN, *Chairman*.

Attest: The foregoing is a true copy of a resolution that was introduced by Vice Chairman Eby, seconded by Commissioner Watkins, and unanimously adopted by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, all six members being present, at the regular meeting of Thursday, February 1, 1951.

JESSE F. NICHOLSON, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

Mr. SCUDDER. I was interested in your statement regarding the difference between Detroit with its manufacturing plants and an area where Government buildings might be built. I do not see where that is very analogous, because the only thing that your district would be losing would be the value of the land. Now, the mere fact that the project was in that location would greatly develop land in that area for tax purposes.

I cannot understand why the Federal Government should obligate itself to pay future indebtedness, such as services that might have to be provided the people who reside in that area. I can understand the necessity of access roads or other facilities that serve the Government needs, where we might be compelled to assume responsibility. But as to any lateral roads servicing the communities in the area, I do not see where the Government should assume the responsibility for those expenses. I believe that any developer would be glad to have the opportunity to develop the area around these dispersal plants, because they should very well assume all of the liability for the matter of education, and so forth, and still make a very fancy profit on the deal.

I believe the State of Maryland will profit greatly through the construction proposed in the area.

In connection with your highway system, I would like to be advised as to the gas tax that you have in the State of Maryland and is all of it applied to highway construction and maintenance?

Mr. LEE. The tax is now applied entirely to highway uses. I am not absolutely certain whether it is 4 cents or 5 cents; it is somewhere in there. There was a time in the past when part of it was diverted to nonhighway uses, but right now it is all going into highway development.

Mr. SCUDDER. That is the trouble in a great many of our States where they have poor highways; that is, they do not use the tax money to maintain or build the highways. Where you find a State with good highways, the people who use them are paying the bill. There is no excuse for bad highways anywhere in the United States, and the only reasen they have them is that their tax system does not support the highways.

Mr. LEE. I agree with you on that.

Mr. SCUDDER. I am very much in sympathy with your idea of cooperation. I think it is fine to cooperate with the planning commission of the city, because I know that we had quite a bit of difficulty in California developing a system of cooperation between the State and the counties and cities. Now the county planning commissions cooperate very closely with the city and as we extend out from the city, we have their cooperation and their sympathy, so that the ideas of the two dovetail. I am very glad to note that your planning commissions are following a continuity of thought in the development of what we might call a Greater Washington.

Mr. LEE. It is a curious coincidence that one of the present members of the Montgomery County Council, which is the local governing body, was formerly a member of a town planning commission in the State of California, the town of Menlo Park. He seems to have migrated east.

Mr. DAVIS. I see your comparison with the city of Detroit a little bit differently from the position assumed by my fine colleague, Mr. Scudder. In other words, if the Federal Government invested $145,000,000 in these buildings in the State of Maryland, you would get no tax return at all from those Federal buildings, would you? They would be tax-free, tax-exempt. But if a corporation, such as an automobile manufacturing plant, should invest $145,003,000 in the State of Maryland, you would have not only that, but a much larger spot that you could tax and you could then get some revenue to support schools and parks and any of the other functions of government.

Mr. LEE. That is precisely our point.

Mr. DAVIS. That is the point that you were making a moment ago. I can see that your section of Maryland is really a bedroom area, as you put it, and I recognize also that it costs more to service residential property, proportionately, than corporate property, such as a manufacturing plant.

Mr. Lee, a great many people in the country are frightened when you use the word planner or planning. I do not subscribe to that philosophy, because I think we ought to have more planning. But

there have been some mistakes made over the country and naturally some people are frightened.

What bothers me at the moment is the fact that you have named so many different planning commissions in this immediate area, county planning commissions. Your own State authority has jurisdiction of only 320 square miles. I am wondering whether Maryland has not a State-wide planning commission that would have responsibility for the entire State.

I am wondering how the National Capital Park and Planning Commission could resolve its difficulties, with so many of these involved, if this amendment becomes a part of the law wherein the Administrator of General Services is directed to use the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and they in turn are directed to consult the local planning commissions and to pay them a part of the cost of making local plans. How do you think that could be reconciled over all?

Mr. LEE. Well, now, it seems to me to be putting into written language what they have already said they were going to do voluntarily.

Mr. Larson's problem, the Administrator's problem, is to build buildings and things like that. He has one or two fairly well recognized planners on his staff, but they are people who know the general textbook principles of planning rather than the specific problems of these individual geographical areas.

Mr. Larson came into the meeting of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission a week ago Friday and said, "Gentlemen, we plan to use you and your Commission and your staff as our planning clearinghouse for this area in the dispersal program," which is news to us.

We simply ask you now, "Please let us commit that to writing and make sure that nothing slips."

I have great faith in Mr. Larson, but for all I know he may drop dead or get another job or disappear some way. We would just like to have it in the bill as a matter of legislative intent on your part.

I did not quite follow you, Mr. Davis, when you talked about the National Commission and its differences from the local. Did you say that?

Mr. DAVIS. With so many local planning commissions involved.

Mr. LEE. Here is the thing: That Commission has for years been working with these local planning commissions on the various different subjects. The National Commission has been working with our commission, for instance, for 22 years now, ever since our commission was formed. They know our problems pretty well. They know our problems a lot better than the General Services Administration will ever know them.

Mr. DAVIS. Tell me this: If the General Services Administrator should go out into Maryland and select a certain site for one of these dispersal buildings, and if your Planning Commission objected to it and said, "Well this just does not conform to our good practices as to transportation, water supply, sewerage, contamination of streams, and so on, and so on, and so on," and you told them that, have you any way on earth to keep them from locating there if they insist that is the spot that they want?

Mr. LEE. No; we do not, as things stand now. I think even if this amendment which Mr. Nolen just placed before you is adopted, I still do not think either we or the National Commission would be able to stop them. I think perhaps in a way we should not be able to stop them. Somebody has to have the final say-so in the matter.

At least, we want to make very sure that they will pause and listen to our suggestions. We take it for granted that men of the stature of Mr. Larson and Mr. Reynolds will be reasonable about these things, and if there is some outstanding objection or some compelling reason why the selected location is very poor, they will presumably back away from it once we have had a chance to talk to them.

Mr. DAVIS. I am not so sure that you are going to gain a lot by reducing this language to writing, that which you have just discussed. I am inclined to think that this is one time when it would be better to trust the good judgment of whoever is the Administrator of General Services, rather than to put language in this bill which may complicate its discussion on the floor. I believe that the General Services Administrator and all those associated with him would of necessity and of good judgment naturally consult the planning people in the State of Maryland or the planning people in the State of Virginia who are making studies and who have information along those lines.

As for me, I doubt the wisdom of complicating this provision by putting this directive language in there, when you could well expect that those men would, of necessity, and in good judgment, consult you gentlemen as these plans would progress.

Mr. LEE. Well, one thing that worries me, not so much as it applies to our Commission, but as it applies to some of the newer and less organized ones in the outer territory, is this: This amendment would authorize the Administrator to pass over a small amount of money to the National Commission for planning studies and so on, and the National Commission could in turn pass some of it on, where needed, to the local planning commissions for their studies. I do not think our Commission is going to need any of that money. We have a pretty good staff already, and we can take this in our stride.

When you get out to the area under the Upper Montgomery Planning Commission, and the Prince William and Loudon County commissions, they have practically no staff at all. I do not think they have any staff. They may need a little help. I do not know if under the language of the bill without the amendment they can provide that, or whether the amendment is needed to make it legal. It certainly should be in there, it seems to me.

Mr. DAVIS. First, I am afraid that the Administrator would get out in deep water if he had to start consulting through the National Planning Commission with all of these local commissions. As I recall it, you named off quickly at least seven.

Mr. LEE. There are seven in Virginia alone.

Mr. DAVIS. There are seven in Virginia alone. I, in this case, would prefer to trust the good judgment of the Administrator of General Services and his capable associates, that this be authorized. I think we are going to lose time in consulting some of these planning commissions which are understaffed. You would set up a force for them to start studying, and before you knew it you would have all sorts of controversies.

If this bill is as important as some seem to indicate—and I think I am growing more and more to think it is important and that time is of the essence—we just cannot stop and talk to too many people. We are just going to have to give them a green light and say, "This mobilization is quickening. Of necessity we have to bring in all these additional people to the city of Washington. We hope that we can find a way to do away with unnecessary employees not only in domestic affairs but in the military as well."

I think it is recognized that we are wasting a lot of manpower, but if we have to move off quickly I think we had better come to some sort of a conclusion and give them the green light and say, "Go ahead," and trust that they are good, capable engineers in the General Services Administration who will move forward. That is my feeling.

Mr. LEE. The last thing in the world we want to do is to jeopardize the whole bill on the floor of the House or of the Senate. You are in a much better position than I am to judge what kind of thing might jeopardize it.

Just as far as our own feelings are concerned, as I said at the beginning, we are inclined to act like country people, and we would just like to see it in writing if it will not jeopardize the bill itself.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. George?

Mr. GEORGE. Is it true that your schools in the suburbs, practically all of them, are in distress, especially in Virginia, with regard to facilities for the number of pupils who are attending there? Is it true that part of them are going only part time and that they could not take care of the problem even without dispersal, and that this will make it that much worse? The people who have to work there do not have any assurance that they will be taken care of; or will the Government be called upon to do that?

Mr. LEE. That is a question I do not know that anybody can answer, Mr. George. Taking this program as a whole, the decentralization part, of course, will take some of the people out of Washington who are living around here now. As Mr. Reynolds said yesterday, it probably will not increase the total number of people living in the city of Washington or the Washington area substantially, but it will amount to a general reshuffling. It is going to be interesting to see how it works out. It will presumably create a need for schools in some new locations. Whether that will be counteracted by a decreasing of the need for expanding existing schools in the closer-in suburbs is pretty much a matter of guesswork.

Mr. GEORGE. I have gone pretty thoroughly into this subject of schools, because I have a boy whom I want to bring back here. I think it would embarrass the people who live here, if you find the conditions as I have found them with regard to schools.

Mr. LEE. That is true. It is not good. I have a boy in Montgomery County in school now, who has to drop 1 day a week simply because there are too many children in the school.

Mr. GEORGE. When you take an industry which comes into a State, it goes on the rolls as a taxable industry. I understand that in this field where we make the payment 100 percent of it will be of benefit to the State. Out in our State we only get 50 percent of the Federal aid if it is on a State highway, and we build our own roads to the industries.

If you bring a big group of people into a State, and they draw reasonably good money, because most Government employers do have white-collared workers and similar type of work, you are creating an asset for that State, normally, over a period of years. I think that instead of you folks being imposed on you are benefiting to a great extent by having this industry furnished to you, and also by the type of people that you normally get in that industry.

Mr. LEE. The type of people is very high, in general. We are glad to have them, frankly.

I am not prepared to disagree with you and Mr. Scudder on the question of schools. I think it is quite possible that these counties may be able to take care of the school matter on their own.

However, I am just giving you an honest warning that you may be hearing from them later on, and if you do it will be because of the fact that they are bedroom counties without a big industrial tax base.

Mr. GEORGE. I think you are probably correct on the schools, due to the fact that they have not taken care of the problem as it is now.

Mr. LEE. You have to appreciate the fantastic rate of growth in these counties. If these counties around Washington were the normal, stable counties the like of which most of you all come from, this problem would not be serious. These counties have doubled and tripled in population in the last 10 or 15 years. It has been a terrific strain already. They are taxed right up to their ears already, and bonded.

Mr. GEORGE. Did they not vote the last bond election down in Virginia on schools?

Mr. LEE. Sir?

Mr. GEORGE. Did they not vote down the last bond election on their schools?

Mr. LEE. Arlington County did. I will never understand it, if I live to be a million.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. LANHAM. Just how extensively does the section share now in Federal funds for school purposes under what was formerly the old Lanham Act and which now has been incorporated into the general bill of permanent legislation providing for contributions by the Federal Government to the local school boards where there is a Federal impact? Do you know how extensively your schools already share in that fund?

Mr. LEE. No; I do not, sir. I want to make sure that we are talking about the same thing. Has that program actually been put into effect yet?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. It has been in effect since the last war. At the last session of Congress it was put in permanent legislative form. I believe $150,000,000 was appropriated for that purpose.

I do not know whether your schools are already sharing in that or not. I understand at the time the bill was passed that nearby Virginia and Maryland schools would get the larger portion of that fund.

Mr. LEE. Is there a separate piece of legislation pending now, or has it just recently been enacted?

Mr. LANHAM. It was recently enacted, in the last session of Congress, and an appropriation was made for it. Those sections of cities and counties which had had a Federal impact had been drawing those funds under emergency legislation.

Mr. LEE. I cannot answer your question precisely, sir. I know that the superintendents of the school systems of all of these counties around Washington have come down here and have appeared both before Congress and before the administrating agencies in an effort to get some help. How much they have received I do not know.

Mr. LANHAM. I think they are getting substantial sums.

That is all.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Pickett?

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Lee, generally speaking, this legislation proposes the authorization of $145,000,000 to locate six dispersal areas within the average vicinity of 20 miles of the District of Columbia. Encompassed in that $145,000,000 is some money required to buy the land, construct the buildings, provide the roads and communications facilities, water supply, and sewage disposal, and all that, as I understand it. That, of course, will have to be done by the General Services Administration.

I would assume that in the selection of the site the General Services Administration would not go to an area that is already intensively developed with residences and business houses located on it, and take that property, and destroy it. They would probably go to property that is vacant, or if not entirely vacant which would have only a few residence locations.

Now, then, there would be required, of course, a lot of planning, which the General Services Administration would do to accomplish those principal objectives. What other planning would you in your agency have to do?

Mr. LEE. Well, you take the planning of a thing like highways involved in this program, Mr. Pickett.

Mr. PICKETT. That is going to be done by the General Services Administration, as I understand it.

Mr. LEE. That is just what we are afraid of, too.

Mr. PICKETT. That is what I am trying to get at. What are you scared of?

Mr. LEE. Sir?

Mr. PICKETT. That is what I want to find out, what you are scared of.

Mr. LEE. That is one of the things we are scared to death of. The highways will be planned to serve that one building and nothing else, and will not be adjusted to fit into any long-range plans that will be of greater benefit for the area as a whole. If the Commission and we, the taxpayers, are going to spend all this money it certainly seems reasonable to spend it in the way to produce the maximum benefit.

Mr. DAVIS. Will you yield a moment?

Mr. PICKETT. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. That planning will be done by Tom McDonald, the the Chief of the Bureau of Roads, and he is just as jealous as can be about his national system of roads. Old Man Tom McDonald is Scotch. He gets more for a dollar than anybody. If he is going to build some road, it is going somewhere, and you can put your last dime on that.

Mr. LEE. That is precisely what I am afraid of.

Mr. DAVIS. You can trust him. He is the only Commissioner of Public Roads that this country has ever had, and he is as jealous about his system as can be. He knows these roads from one end of this country to another. You can depend on him. He will not throw any money away.

Mr. LEE. It is not a matter of throwing money away.

Seeing that you brought this up yourself I will give you a little specimen. One of the roads that Mr. McDonald's engineers, along with the Maryland State Roads Commission's engineers, have been investigating in the last couple of weeks—and I have been doing it along with them—is the completion of the so-called national pike. It is the main road from Cumberland and Frederick and west into Washington, which is being rebuilt now by Maryland with the normal Federal aid up around the Frederick County line. They have been trying to survey a route to bring it into Washington.

If the Bureau of Public Roads engineers alone have the determination of that matter, they have already indicated that that road is going to be just as straight as it can be, and it is going to slash its way right through the best part of Bethesda, the Massachusetts Avenue section of Bethesda.

Everyone of you down here in Congress is going to start hearing some from the constituents you have living out there, because it is going through people's back yards and bedrooms and everything else.

I contend that with a little help and consultation from the local planners, and from Mr. Nolen's outfit, the road can be built just as well and just as cheaply and without such extraordinary damage. However, I have been out in the woods and in the subdivisions with these Public Roads and Maryland State Roads Commission engineers, and I know only too well precisely what they are up to. That is why I am down here today.

Mr. DAVIS. They have one in Chicago that goes right in the middle of the post office.

Mr. LEE. I believe it.

Mr. DAVIS. But it was designed properly that it should go right there, because a greater number of people were served by the route that was designated. It has been rather costly, but everybody over there liked it. We had a colleague from Illinois on this committee not so long ago, and he said, "That was the thing to do," because it services hundreds of thousands of travelers every day.

Mr. LEE. Quite often that is necessary; there is no question about that, but in this particular case I am talking about the route they have selected serves the least number of people so far as the commuters are concerned.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKETT. Certainly.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The Maryland State Highway Commission is taking that over; is that not true—they are establishing the locations—or at least have something to say about it.

Mr. LEE. The Maryland Highway Commission and the Bureau of Public Roads are in this together, sir. The relationship I cannot determine. The Maryland Highway Commission is in the position of receiving a lot of money from the Bureau of Public Roads. When it comes down to deciding where the route is going to be, suppose there is a disagreement between those two agencies? Which one will have the final say in the matter? My bet is that it will go along with the purse strings.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Then I think you should also file your objections, if you are not in accord with the alinement, with the Maryland Highway Commission.

Mr. LEE. Believe me I already have. I have filed them very volubly and vigorously.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Thank you, Mr. Pickett.

Mr. PICKETT. Now, in addition to planning the location of these highways, what other planning do you want to have something to say about?

Mr. LEE. Well, there is the entire problem. There are some planning matters which will be certainly under strictly local control, no matter what happens. There are all the problems relating to subdivision control and subdivisions that presumably will follow these agencies, and local zoning and things like that.

Mr. PICKETT. That, of course, is strictly a local problem, as you recognize.

Mr. LEE. That we do not ask to have anybody help us out on.

Mr. PICKETT. What other planning problems, though, that are not strictly local, would you want to have some voice in, Mr. Lee?

Mr. LEE. There is the matter of sewer and water facilities for these places. Yesterday down here there was conflicting testimony.

I noticed that one witness—I think it was Colonel Potts, but I am not sure whether it was he or Mr. Jones—said that they rather hoped to provide independent water facilities, and I think sewer, too, for each one of these places, so that in the event of enemy action and destruction of the main Washington water system these places would be able to go on alone. Then later in the day I believe Mr. Reynolds said they hoped to extend the existing systems out to the proposed agencies.

Mr. PICKETT. I did not understand that they hoped to tie into these 20-mile dispersed zones the facilities provided from the District of Columbia. It was my understanding that the suggestion was made in connection with the already existing facilities of the local communities in the vicinity of the immediate area, or adjacent to where they will locate these dispersal sites.

Mr. LEE. In Maryland we have an agency known as the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission which covers roughly but not exactly the same area as our planning commission. It operates in both Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties. Its district does go out as far as the Gaithersburg area, which has been considered one of the eligible areas in this plan. Whether they will avail themselves of the services of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, or put up a separate one, is something I do not know.

Mr. PICKETT. In connection with the activities for planning that you would be interested in having some voice in, those would be relative to the roads and highways, the water and sewerage disposal, and what else?

Mr. LEE. In the matter of selecting the actual dispersal sites themselves; that, of course, is the $64 question in the whole business. Frankly, we would like to be consulted in that. We readily concede that we should not have any final say in the matter, and it should not be left up to us.

Mr. PICKETT. Your general proposition, as I see it, Mr. Lee, is that you recognize they can come out wherever they want to come, whether you want them to or not?

Mr. LEE. That has been our experience in the past.

Mr. PICKETT. You are not seeking them, but since they are going to get there now you are going to take what comes and make the best of it?

Mr. LEE. That is what we want to do, to make the best of it, precisely.

Mr. PICKETT. For that purpose you endorse the amendment here that proposes to authorize and direct the General Services Administration to utilize the services of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. That is part of it, and then you go further and endorse the amendment that says that the General Services Administrator shall advance such sums to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission as it in its judgment may deem desirable and necessary to furnish to the local planning agencies, and to reimburse the local planning agencies, any sums they might spend in connection with it.

Have you any idea how much money that is going to take for these local planning agencies that need some assistance?

Mr. LEE. No, sir; I cannot pretend to answer that. I should think it would be relatively a small amount. I think in the case of my own commission it would be probably nothing at all.

However, with regard to something such as Prince William or Loudon Counties, they might need some help.

Mr. PICKETT. Of course, those planning commissions that have no staff, if they were promised a little money to use, would naturally go out and get a staff. Then the members of the staff, as members, would naturally go out and execute a bunch of plans, or think up something, and the first thing you know you will have a merry-go-round going, will you not?

Mr. LEE. They had better watch out about getting a permanent staff, because this is not permanent money.

Mr. PICKETT. I know of nothing that is more permanent than a Government agency of any kind.

Mr. LEE. You have something there, Congressman.

Mr. PICKETT. That is true whether it is a national agency or a local or State government agency. They all want to justify their continued existence, and they can always find some reason for it.

Of course, that is usually a matter for the local people to worry about, insofar as they select the local personnel and keep them on the job. However, when it comes down to the fact that the people in California or in Texas are going to be taxed to reimburse those planners for the local work to be done, then it becomes my business, representing the people of the area from which I come.

We do not know how much it will cost. Therefore, we do not know how much it would reduce the available funds authorized to be appropriated to be used by the General Services Administration. Do you not think you are in the wrong forum for that at the moment, Mr. Lee? As I understand it, there is another committee of Congress which is holding hearings now in connection with some of the matters you have mentioned, with respect to schools and other facilities that are necessary as a result of the impact of the increased national defense effort.

Mr. LEE. Wait a minute. Let us make a clear distinction between this school stuff and the planning as such. This financial provision

in this amendment is for planning only. That costs very little, and if done right it will save an awful lot of money for all concerned.

Mr. PICKETT. You do not think that they would do any planning in this without taking the schools into consideration, do you?

Mr. LEE. Without taking what, sir?

Mr. PICKETT. Without taking the schools into consideration.

Mr. LEE. Certainly, but they may build the schools with their own money.

Mr. PICKETT. Would not the schools be involved in the necessary planning, if there were an influx of citizens to the community in the area of the dispersal site?

Mr. LEE. It is one function to plan the location of a school and an entirely different one to build the school.

Mr. PICKETT. I am just talking about the planning.

Mr. LEE. Yes.

Mr. PICKETT. You have to plan the location, and somebody has to pay for that planning.

Mr. LEE. I for one would greatly prefer to see all of the schools in Montgomery County built by Montgomery County and paid for by Montgomery County, on the same general theory as to the highway business, that the control of the schools will follow the purse strings. I would like to see our schools continue to be controlled by the people of Montgomery County. There is no question in my mind about that.

Mr. PICKETT. I agree with you that that would be a fine thing. Would you like to plan and build this road with your own money?

Mr. LEE. No, sir.

Mr. PICKETT. You could not do it, could you?

Mr. LEE. We do not have that much money. We never will, the way things are going now.

Mr. PICKETT. I think you are absolutely correct about it, that the determining factor is going to be the control of the purse strings. When you get to this question of planning and furnishing the money through the authorization here requested, for each one of the seven or more local planning commissions, then you are just inviting a complicated situation which I see no practical end to until after the accomplishment of the ultimate objective, when you will have about as many ideas of whether it was done rightly or wrongly as you have planning commissions to deal with.

Mr. LEE. Here is the thing. Suppose that the Administrator undertakes to suddenly locate a dispersal point in Prince William County which, as far as I know, has no planning regulations at all. The county may have an urgent immediate need to draft a set of subdivision regulations, a zoning ordinance, and a building code, or something like that, which are all considered to be a direct result of the sudden arrival of this dispersal plan. They may want to hire a lawyer for 2 months or so to sit down and write those things so that the county board of supervisors can enact them. I do not think it would be unfair for the Administrator to pay that lawyer's fee for the 2 months, frankly.

Mr. PICKETT. Well, now, let us get specifically down to this question of the roads. I do not understand that in the proposal here they are going to take any existing road and destroy it and do away with it. It is my impression that they propose to construct the necessary

access road which is primarily designed to serve the place at which the dispersal area is located. Why would it not be advantageous to the community or communities through which that road runs just to have it go through there and leave the existing roads and facilities where they are?

Mr. LEE. If the road is going through a completely residential neighborhood, as would be the case of Route 240—the Frederick-Cumberland one we were discussing a moment ago—it is certainly not advantegeous to the immediate residential area through which it passes. It may be helpful to the people who are five or six blocks away. This particular route that they are surveying now goes through some of the nicest and quietest residential suburbs in Montgomery County, where the people have spent $20,000 or $30,000 to buy themselves homes where they can get back off the main roads and where their children can grow up with some degree of safety from traffic. All of a sudden in comes a freeway through their back yard. That is not a benefit.

Mr. PICKETT. I can understand that it would not be beneficial to the people whose property is immediately affected. Of course, the determination of the illustration which you have just given is not a part of this subject we are dealing with immediately. The same problem might obtain.

Mr. LEE. That is true; yes, sir.

Mr. PICKETT. On the whole, as we look at it from the whole picture, would it not be advantageous to the community, excluding, of course, the persons immediately affected?

Mr. LEE. I would say so; yes, sir.

Mr. PICKETT. In the construction of a road anywhere you are going to displace somebody, whether you go through a man's dairy farm or a cattle ranch, or whatever it is.

Mr. LEE. Yes.

Mr. PICKETT. He does not like to have his pasture cut up into segments for a highway. Some of the most bitter litigation I have ever known of is occasioned by that very thing.

Mr. LEE. Very true.

Mr. PICKETT. On the whole did it not serve a better purpose to build the road than to not build it?

Mr. LEE. The one possible exception to that is if they would locate the expressway in one of the river valley parks, either along the Potomac River or down Rock Creek or the Anacostia River, or something like that. That is one way where you do not upset anybody, except the Park Service.

Mr. PICKETT. Of course, in the beginning when they set up that park they took somebody's land, and that discommoded him.

Mr. LEE. That is true.

Mr. PICKETT. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Bray?

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Lee, I think you have presented this matter very well, but your presentation demonstrates the difficulty of your position.

I am rather inclined to agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Davis and with Mr. Pickett. Here you keep bringing more commissions and more bureaus and more agencies into that thing. These are the very reasons that opponents are necessitating this dispersal.

I trust that no one here is naive enough to believe that this dispersal planning is going to take more people out of Washington. They will all stay here anyway, and you will just have that many more people here. The work that one man used to do now requires several.

In my office one of my secretaries spends much of her time trying to find out what this agency and this bureau and this commission is, and what they do.

Here you are bringing into this already complicated situation another commission or a bureau—I believe it is a commission—and then many more piling on and on. If it keeps on there will not be room enough in all the State of Maryland to hold them.

I would just like to see us make this a little less complicated.

Mr. LEE. Yes.

Mr. BRAY. I just feel that you are going to make it more and more complicated. Whether this should be done at all or not is a question.

If I were Mr. Larson I certainly would not want to have it put in my hands and be forced to deal with this planning commission and all of these others. I trust he is all right. I do not know. I do not know anything about him, but I cannot help but notice that he is not here testifying for it. That is something that stands out very plainly in my mind.

I do not blame you. If I were out there and they were running that highway through, I would try to stop it. Building greater and greater bureaus and expanding the Government means that you have to have these highways.

Mr. LEE. The thing that puzzles me then, sir, is why did Mr. Larson go into the National Planning Commission meeting 10 days ago and tell them definitely that he was planning to use them as a central planning agency?

Mr. BRAY. There is nothing to keep Mr. Larson from consulting with them or anyone.

I do not know whether Mr. Larson is doing a good job or a bad job. I know nothing about it. I have only been here since very recently. To force Mr. Larson to merely consult with the commission would only complicate the situation. It would add another commission.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Lanham?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Lee, would you be in favor of the amendment if the contribution were eliminated? It seems to me a very reasonable request that your local planning boards be consulted in this dispersal business, but it does seem a little out of line that they shall contribute any money to the local planning authorities.

Would you be in favor of the amendment, eliminating that feature of it?

Mr. LEE. Speaking for my own commission, Mr. Lanham, I would say "Yes," we would still be in favor of it, because, as I say, we have a fairly well organized staff and we can get by without any help. You might get some objection or dissent from the planning bodies out in the outer fringe of Prince William County, Loudon, upper Montgomery Counties, and that section.

Mr. LANHAM. I recall in the last highway bill that there was an amendment proposed, or there was a proposition, that a certain amount of money be paid to all the local counties so that they might employ engineers. It created a lot of opposition to the legislation. I am afraid it would in this case.

Mr. LEE. I can see your point.

Mr. LANHAM. It would be a mistake to give anybody the authority to put in money to set up a planning commission or to employ an engineer or an attorney. However, it seems to me to be a very reasonable request that the national authoities confer with the local planning boards. Of course, they will have the final decision, but they should also consult with the people who are in the community.

Mr. LEE. I think we would be definitely for the amendment with or without the financial provision, sir.

Mr. LANHAM. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Blatnik?

Mr. BLATNIK. I have no questions.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I would like to ask one question, Mr. Chairman.

Getting back to Mr. Bray's statement, relative to Mr. Larson, has Mr. Larson by a statement or inference in any way said that he would not consult with your Commission?

Mr. LEE. No, he has never stated or implied that he would not. In the past, however, we have had some very peculiar experiences, Mr. McGregor, in the matter of sudden and unheralded arrival of large Federal installations in our very midst which have done great violence to existing local plans. I could sit here for a half hour giving you chapter and verse on that. I will spare you unless you want it.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You have nothing concrete relative to this proposal?

Mr. LEE. No, sir.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You are just looking at the record.

Mr. LEE. That is the record. Hope springs eternal for the future;

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Lee.

Mr. LEE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Tuemmler? Mr. Tuemmler, it is getting close to noon and we would like to stop at lunchtime, but we are ready to hear you, sir.

## STATEMENT OF FRED W. TUEMMLER, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. TUEMMLER. I will make my comments brief, sir.

My name is Fred W. Tuemmler. I am director of planning for the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in charge of its Prince Georges County regional office. I am a member of the American Institute of Planners and an associate member of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

I have listened, gentlemen, to Mr. Lee's testimony and the questions directed to him and his answers. I think I would like to emphasize that what we are hoping to achieve through the proposed amendment is the maximum amount of coordination so that if these Federal agencies are located in our communities or in the peripheral areas we will not have to deal with a multiplicity of agencies, as was suggested by one of the Congressmen when Mr. Lee was testifying.

It the National Capital Park and Planning Commission were designated as the central planning agency to coordinate Federal and local interests, a great deal of the administrative turmoil would be eliminated.

I think it is a great tragedy for the Washington region that the bill which was before the last Congress which would have reorganized the National Commission and given it some such authority was not passed. We in the Maryland commission endorsed that bill. Unfortunately it was not as well thought of in some quarters, and it did not pass.

However, the very fact that it is proposed to establish Federal agencies in our outlying areas, the very fact that it will require tremendous and serious adjustment in plans that have been prepared heretofore, and plans now in preparation, indicates that the local planning agencies will have a tremendous job on their hands, and especially so if it is necessary to deal with not just one agency as a coordinating body which will act as chairman, shall we say, to those coming to the same table, but to deal with the General Services Administration, the Bureau of Public Roads, and Lord knows how many others. They in turn will have the same problem.

Planning a community is a job of determining relationships among many things. As a matter of fact, our enabling legislation, which is chapter 992 of the Laws of Maryland, 1943, as amended, authorizes and directs the Commission to prepare a general or master plan to guide the physical development of the Maryland-Washington regional district. It says, "to guide in an orderly manner."

You can only achieve orderly development if there is coordination of all of the various elements that make up the community. Among the things that are included in the plan and for which the Commission is given authority are locations of roads, highways, bridges, parks and parkways, public buildings, including, in fact, Federal public buildings. In other words, we are designated as the agency to coordinate local activities with those of the Federal Government. There is a whole host of other things that are important in providing facilities or services to local communities.

The Commission is also designated as the representative of the State of Maryland in dealing with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and with such other agencies or offices of the Federal Government as may have activities in our region.

Now, near the close of Mr. Lee's testimony he cited the fact, or he said, that we had had some experience with centers being located improperly with respect to other facilities. He did not give a definite example, but I can give one right over in Montgomery County. When the National Institute of Health was expanded it took in more extensive territory and the area included a section that we had suggested for the path of a particular cross-county major highway. The highway has to be adjusted, and in doing so it is not directional. It is not as good. It will result in the invasion of other residential areas.

Yet, at the time the center was established and the grounds were purchased, there was no consideration given to that proposed road. It follows that a local planning commission cannot do its job, cannot do the job that has been assigned to it by the State of Maryland, if there is that disregard of local and sometimes more than local facilities. It is for that reason that we believe it is essential that there be a planning coordinating body, and, of course, we think that the National Commission should be that body, and that we should cooperate with the individual Federal agencies through it.

Now, with respect to the provision of funds, we are not looking for a hand-out. We can do our planning job within the Maryland-Washington regional district, which takes in some 320 square miles of Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties. We can do it and we have done it during the most pressing period of this Washington region's expansion.

Just to give you an example of what that has been, in 1900 the population of Prince Georges County was 30,000 people. It took from then up until 1940 for that population to go up to 90,000. In other words, the population increased 60,000 in 40 years. However, from 1940 to 1950 the population increased 117 percent, and went from 90,000 to 193,000. That is 117 percent, and you can do the subtraction and see what it means in actual people.

Within the area that the Commission has jurisdiction over, that portion of Prince Georges County included in the Maryland-Washington regional district, we issued building permits for dwelling units to house our population which would be equal to the entire population of Frederick and Hagerstown, Md. In other words, 75,000 or 80,000 persons. That is the kind of expansion we have had.

Surely, we have had shortcomings. We do not have a large staff. We wish we had more staff. Limitations of money, of course, are one of the reasons why you do not increase your staff.

Among the provisions of our act is one which authorizes us at the request of any local governmental agency having jurisdiction in the counties to extend our planning studies to those areas.

Our regional district, if I may show you a map, includes the territory encompassed within the brown line. Our regional district takes in this territory here [indicating] encompassed within this brown line, about 320 square miles. Here [indicating] is the rest of Montgomery County, having about 485 square miles. The rest of Prince Georges County has about 490 square miles altogether.

Here [indicating] are lines indicating distances from the zero milestone, 5 miles; 10 miles; 12 miles; 14; 16; 18; 20.

Somewhere, perhaps in the belt between 14 and 20 miles from downtown, I presume that most of these facilities will be located. I believe I read in the paper that someone said they should not be less than 20 miles, but then not more than 20 miles, because that would make it difficult to have face-to-face conferences, which was considered to be so important, because the distance would be so great.

Assuming that they are in this outlying area, and the Commission is requested to extend its studies to these areas not now served, that is going to mean we will have to employ more staff to do it. To employ more staff you must pay salaries. We do not mind taking on a reasonable burden in this planning studies work, but I think it is reasonable to expect some assistance when the job that is being put on us is not of our own doing, when it results from the extension of additional Federal centers in our area.

I might say, incidentally, that all these places that are colored in in yellow on this map are the Federal centers of employment—Taylor Model Boat Basin, National Institutes of Health, Army Medical Center, Army Map Center, Naval Ordnance Laboratory Research Center, Andrews Field, St. Elizabeths Farm. There are one or two outside, not colored in. The naval air station, and one or two others. They are in the outlying areas.

Here is what it means. It means that land-use studies, subdivision control, building inspection, the preparation of a zoning ordinance, and maps to cover these undeveloped areas, will have to be done if they are going to have the impact of new Federal centers of employment, because what will that do? It will mean that with the new Federal center of employment there will be speculative activities in the surrounding area. Employees like to live reasonably close to their place of employment if they can. It will mean new housing projects. New housing projects will mean more schools, more commercial facilities, more roads, more playgrounds, and more of everything. It means more police protection and more fire protection and all the things required such as water and sewerage. All of those things will have to be provided. However, before they are provided the planning for them will have to be done first. That is where we come in. It is that planning that we are worried about at this point.

Any questions with regard to funds for actually building the facilities are something that perhaps must come later. We are concerned now with the planning job, and we are very seriously concerned, because we realize that if there are two or three or four alternate sites under consideration that site A might be quite advantageous for our community but sites B, C, and D may not be. Unless we have the opportunity to present our views and get our thoughts across and unless we have the help and assistance of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, which is authorized by Congress to prepare a comprehensive plan for the District of Columbia, and which has advisory responsibility in the environs, unless we can do that a great deal of the work we have done already and much of our future work will go for naught.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Are there any questions?

(No response.)

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Tuemmler. You have made an excellent statement.

Mr. TUEMMLER. I presume, sir, that the copies of the resolution which were prepared have already been put in the record?

Mr. TRIMBLE. They are already in the record.

Mr. TUEMMLER. Yes, sir. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The members of the committee want to be on the House floor for a few moments, and without objection the subcommittee will be adjourned until 1:30.

(Thereupon, at 11:56 a. m., Tuesday, February 6, 1951, a recess was taken until 1:30 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The subcommittee reconvened, pursuant to the recess, at 1:30 p. m., Hon. James W. Trimble, chairman, presiding.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The subcommittee will be in order.

Mr. Tuemmler, I believe, had further testimony to present. You may proceed at this time, Mr. Tuemmler.

## STATEMENT OF FRED W. TUEMMLER—Resumed

Mr. TUEMMLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me an opportunity to appear again. This morning some reference was made to the amount of money that might be needed for extended planning work out into our areas. I think it was Mr. Lanham who asked about that.

As I recall it, the last bill which was before Congress had an amendment proposed by the National Commission which suggested that two-tenths of 1 percent be made available for such work.

Without having any detailed figures as to the amount of money that might be required, but merely based upon the expenditures which we now have in our Prince Georges County regional office, I would say that possibly an additional $50,000 for a year would help us immeasurably to employ additional staff, engineers, planners, draftsmen, and other personnel and, perhaps, pay for some of the expendable materials that we might need.

If that same amount were applied say to the Montgomery County portion, that would mean roughly $100,000 for the Maryland side, within those two counties. And perhaps if there were a comparable amount for the Virginia side, that would be $200,000. And it might be necessary to have approximately the same amount for the National Commission. That is simply by way of expanding those figures.

I am speaking with respect to the $50,000 for our area. I think that would be a reasonably good estimate. Whether it would be reasonable to apply the same amount to the others I do not know definitely.

But if this were the apportionment, it would come fairly close to the recommended percentage that the National Commission gave when the previous bill was under consideration, because two-tenths of 1 percent would provide about $380,000. That, of course, is $80,000 more than the $300,000 that I have just suggested. But it indicates the approximate amount that might be required for extending these planning studies to areas not now served by planning staffs.

I think that is an important thing, because it is always better to think in terms of real dollars than in terms of percentages. Obviously in a $190,000,000 appropriation, a sum that size is not a large sum when one considers the savings that will result in those expenditures. And I say savings because if the planning of any of these new centers is done without the coordination that is required, both the Federal Government and the States and the local communities will be saddled with unnecessary expenses.

There is always a tendency, when we are faced with an emergency, to make hasty decisions; but, once these centers are fixed, they are going to be there for a long, long time—forever, as far as we are concerned. And any of the mistakes that are made are going to have far-reaching repercussions.

Therefore, we stress again the desirability of having a coordinated job done in the beginning. And I stress that again because I think it is important to recognize the fact that the machinery is all set up. It is not going to be necessary to staff other agencies. If the General Services Administration, if the Bureau of Public Roads, and if other Federal organizations have to do their own planning and do all of

the things that have already been done by the other commissions, they are going to have to employ more staff, too; and they can avail themselves of the work and the studies and the plans that have been made heretofore and of the facilities and services that we can offer.

We merely hope that by putting this in the bill that that directive will be emphasized and that the necessary coordination will be carried out. I think that is efficiency in Government.

Mr. PICKETT. I would like to ask this question, if I may. This program is one of an emergent nature requiring speedy action, or it is not. If it is not, then probably none is going to be recommended by this committee. If it is, then the matter of time is, of course, of great consequence. Would the adoption of the amendment proposed by Mr. Nolen and endorsed by you and Mr. Lee and others have the effect of hastening or delaying the construction of the facilities at these dispersal points, in your opinion?

Mr. TUEMMLER. No; I do not think the adoption of the amendment would delay the selection of the sites. The decisions regarding the sites probably have to be made fairly soon; and, on the basis of information which we now have, it is not going to require long, protracted studies. But that is the beginning of the problem. From that point on, then all of the related things that must be planned for have to be done. It is from that point on, after the sites are selected, that the job of providing highways, providing for other local services, providing for housing, and so forth, must be done. That must be done afterward. And it is, shall we say, like dropping stones into a pond. When the stone hits the water, that is the selection of the site. But from then on you have ripples that go on and on and on until they reach the shore, and those will continue long after the site has been selected, far into the future.

Mr. PICKETT. We recognize that the selection of the site is not going to relieve the emergent nature of the problem. If we are going to go through with it, the only thing that will relieve the situation is the accomplishment of the purpose, which is the completion of the building and the facilities that are necessary to be used. Obviously, to have any utility, they have got to have the highway approaches, the communication facilities, and other things that are all envisioned in this proposal. To complete the accomplishment of the purpose, which is to put them in use, to put the Federal positions in there that will be moved out, is this planning proposition that you are talking about going to have the effect of delaying that date?

Mr. TUEMMLER. I think it will expedite it.

Mr. PICKETT. You think it will expedite it?

Mr. TUEMMLER. Yes, sir; I do. I think it will expedite it, because we who are doing the planning work are fully familiar with the problems in the area. We know where the population is. We know what its distribution is. We know where existing facilities are located, and where they are planned.

We have some plans. We simply hope that when the selections are made it will be with the least amount of dislocation of existing facilities, and that we will be given an opportunity to work in conjunction with the agencies concerned, so that we can create the kind of communities that you want and everyone wants in this Washington area.

I notice that one of the stated purposes of the bill is to provide for the continuance at all times of the conduct of the vital business of Government and for the sound development of the District of Columbia and its adjacent areas.

To accomplish the sound development of the District of Columbia and its adjacent areas, coordination is necessary and highly desirable, and I think it will expedite rather than delay any of the activities of the individual agencies concerned with this problem.

Mr. PICKETT. You do not think that the necessity for consultation with and revision of plans in conjunction with the several planning agencies of the various localities would in any sense of the word delay any part of this program?

Mr. TUEMMLER. I do not think it will delay the program, because if the National Capital Park and Planning Commission is designated as the coordinating body it can bring together all of those agencies of the Federal Government and the local governments concerned and act as the moderator, if you will, or the coordinator, to solve the problems; and it can be done much more rapidly than by having each agency, whether local or Federal, individually run around to all the others and try to make its peace or adjust its plans, one with the other, because there is bound to be a considerable overlapping and there is bound to be need for going back and forth several times instead of perhaps once to solve a problem.

We have had the experience on many occasions. We have worked with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission for many years. We have worked with other agencies. We may have the State Roads Commission of Maryland and the county engineer and the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission and our Commission—the National Capital Park and Planning Commission—the United States Engineer's Office and the Bureau of Public Roads all sitting around a table at one time discussing a problem. And the case that I just made reference to was when we were discussing the flood-control plan for the Anacostia River. We brought together all of those groups, and it was the National Commission that acted as the coordinator and helped to solve the problem.

Mr. PICKETT. Thank you.

Mr. TRIMBLE. There are no further questions; thank you, Mr. Tuemmler.

Mr. TUEMMLER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The next witness is Mr. Cecil Eby. Mr. Eby, you may give your name and your position to the reporter, for the record.

## STATEMENT OF CECIL EBY, VICE CHAIRMAN, MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Mr. EBY. I am Cecil Eby, vice chairman of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Mr. Lee told you in his testimony that he only recently resigned, and I succeeded him about a month ago. The reason for the technical staff appearing first was that they could answer questions that we could not.

I wanted to inform you of the commission's attitude. We agree thoroughly with the technical staff. We do not think that this dis-

persal plan, despite the fact that you have considered it before, is something that can be handled over a period of time. If it is workable, as Mr. Pickett has said, it must be done immediately. We need rapid action. For that reason we are not regarding it from any standpoint of advantage or disadvantage to the county. It may be an inconvenience to us, but it is an inconvenience to be dodging bullets over in Korea.

Our principal idea is, in offering this amendment, to be of help. We are doing so because we know the advantages of planning, not only now but for later on.

We feel that the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission can work with the National Commission as a coordinating agency, as we put it in our resolution. We say a coordinating agency; just as you gentlemen have set up a subcommittee, this National Commission will be in the sense of a subcommittee working with all these others, the planning agencies of the surrounding territory on which the General Services Administration can call for information.

With that as your agency, these other planning commissions can furnish the technical data that they already have and it will be available to you for greater use and with less waste of time. To us that is the logical plan. Thank you.

Mr. TRIMBLE. If there are no questions, thank you very much, Mr. Eby. Mr. Nolen said that he wanted to make a further statement, and we should be glad to hear him at this time.

## FURTHER STATEMENT OF JOHN NOLEN, JR.

Mr. NOLEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There were some questions asked me this morning about our existing legislation. I did not have at hand a copy of the 1926 act under which we operate. There has been so much discussion, following my testimony, about the relationship between the National Commission and the local planning commissions in the environs that I thought it might be well to put in the record exactly what the law states and which has been on the statute books for approximately 25 years.

I am quoting now from the act of April 30, 1926, which amended the act of June 6, 1924, section 1 (b) of which says—

> That the said Commission is hereby charged with the duty of preparing, developing, and maintaining a comprehensive, consistent, and coordinated plan for the National Capital and its environs. * * *

Then it goes on to state what the elements of the plan may be. The second sentence in this paragraph states:

> It is the purpose of this Act to obtain the maximum amount of cooperation and correlation of effort between the Departments, Bureaus, and Commissions of the Federal and District Governments.

And further:

> The Commission may, as to the environs of the District of Columbia, act in conjunction and cooperation with such representatives of the States of Maryland and Virginia as may be designated by such States for this purpose.

Under that latter clause in particular we have had long and close relations with the Maryland Commission, because it is the oldest of the local planning agencies in the area. Its legislation set it up some-

what as a counterpart of the National Commission. Perhaps that is the reason they are here, not at our instigation but on their own initiative today to support this amendment. They see the need for it, in this emergency situation.

Now, the effect of what we are asking in this amendment is to make it possible for the Commission to work under an existing statute, which is not workable in our belief to this extended territory, with this sudden impact of new responsibilities, because it needs these two things: first, the extended territory authorization for this Commission to work in, and second, the financial aids that Mr. Tuemmler has just spoken of and which represent relatively a very small proportion of the total costs.

Now, why is it necessary to do this planning? I do not think there has been enough said on that. There are two phases to it. The first is prior to the decisions on the location of projects which will be made by the Administrator of General Services, and these will come, in my opinion, relatively quickly. There will not be much opportunity to do any advance planning so that we will have to get along with what planning has already been done, and the basic knowledge that those who have been here a long time have of the territory, and settle for that. That will allow the Administrator to proceed with his basic program, the part of the program that is going to take the initial time. But that is only the beginning of the planning problems.

From there on—and the Administrator has said this himself in public meetings, or his representatives have—from there on, it is the responsibility of the localities to do the planning; to adjust the development which will ensue, to each dispersal project. That is the phase which we are concerned about most, because it will be the phase in which coordination will be desirable between the other Federal agencies that will be aiding the program, in one way or another, and the local communities.

Now, such things as an entirely new zoning plan will be required in some jurisdictions, to adjust to this new factor that will completely change the economic base for the community. Some of these outlying areas do not even have building regulations. Some of them do not have applicable subdivision regulations. New thoroughfare plans will need to be developed. Problems of community water supply or sewage disposal, which General Services is not concerned with, for they will be only responsible for the area around which the fence will be put. The problems that are community planning problems have been repeatedly emphasized by the General Services Administration as those for the local communities. So, it is in order to aid those local communities to solve their problems in cooperation with our Commission as the coordinating agency of the Federal Government that we are asking for this amendment.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that about covers the additional points that I wanted to try to clarify.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Are there any questions?

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I might ask the gentleman if he would not supply for the record the number of the act to which he referred a few minutes ago.

Mr. NOLEN. I have a copy of it here.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I would suggest that you put it in the record at this point.

Mr. NOLEN. I shall do that and, if you would like, I will put in the comparable part of the Maryland Commission Act to which I referred, also.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

SECTION 1 OF THE ACT APPROVED JUNE 6, 1924 (43 STAT. 463), ESTABLISHING THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK COMMISSION, FOR WHICH SECTION THE ACT APPROVED APRIL 30, 1926, WAS SUBSTITUTED

AN ACT Providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital

~~*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That to preserve the flow of water in Rock Creek, to prevent pollution of Rock Creek and the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, to preserve forests and natural scenery in and about Washington, and to provide for the comprehensive systematic, and continuous development of the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital, there is hereby constituted a commission, to be known as the National Capital Park Commission, composed of the Chief of Engineers of the Army, the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, the Director of the National Park Service, the Chief of the Forest Service, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds and the chairmen of the Committees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and House of Representatives. At the close of each Congress the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint, respectively, a Senator-elect and a Representative-elect to the succeeding Congress to serve as members of this commission until the chairmen of committees of the succeeding Congress shall be chosen. The officer in charge of public buildings and grounds shall be the executive and disbursing officer of said commission.~~

ACT APPROVED APRIL 30, 1926, AMENDING AND SUBSTITUTED FOR SECTION 1 OF ABOVE ACT AND ESTABLISHING THE NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

AN ACT Amending the Act entitled "An Act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital," approved June 6, 1924

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 1 of the Act approved June 6, 1924, entitled "An Act providing for a comprehensive development of the park and playground system of the National Capital," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. (a) That to develop a comprehensive, consistent, and coordinated plan for the National Capital and its environs in the States of Maryland and Virginia, to preserve the flow of water in Rock Creek, to prevent pollution of Rock Creek and the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers, to preserve forests and natural scenery in and about Washington, and to provide for the comprehensive, systematic, and continuous development of park, parkway, and playground systems of the National Capital and its environs there is hereby constituted a commission to be known as the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, composed of the Chief of Engineers of the Army, the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, the Director of the National Park Service, the Chief of the Forest Service, the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, the chairmen of the Committees on the District of Columbia of the Senate and House of Representatives, and four eminent citizens well qualified and experienced in city planning, one of whom shall be a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia, to be appointed for the term of six years by the President of the United States: *Provided,* That the first members appointed under this Act shall continue in office for terms of three, four, five, and six years respectively from the date of the passage of this Act, the terms of each to be designated by the President; but their successors shall be appointed for terms of six years, except that any person chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. All members of the said commission shall serve without compensation therefor, but each shall be paid actual expenses of subsistence not in excess of $10 per day and of travel when attending meetings of said commission or engaged in investigations pertaining to its activities. At the close of each Congress the presiding officer of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall appoint, respectively, a Senator and a Representative

elect to the succeeding Congress to serve as members of this commission until the chairmen of the committees of the succeeding Congress shall be chosen. The Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital shall be executive and disbursing officer of said commission.

"(b) That the said commission is hereby charged with the duty of preparing, developing, and maintaining a comprehensive, consistent, and coordinated plan for the National Capital and its environs, which plan shall include recommendations to the proper executive authorities as to traffic and transportation; plats and subdivisions; highways, parks, and parkways; school and library sites; playgrounds; drainage, sewerage, and water supply; housing, building, and zoning regulations; public and private buildings; bridges and water fronts; commerce and industry; and other proper elements of city and regional planning. It is the purpose of this Act to obtain the maximum amount of cooperation and correlation of effort between the departments, bureaus, and commissions of the Federal and District Governments. To this end plans and records, or copies thereof, shall be made available to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission when requested. The commission may, as to the environs of the District of Columbia, act in conjunction and cooperation with such representatives of the States of Maryland and Virginia as may be designated by such States for this purpose. The said commission is hereby authorized to employ the necessary personal services, including the personal services of a director of planning and other expert city planners, such as engineers, architects, and landscape architects. Such technical experts may be employed at rates not in excess of those paid for similar services elsewhere and as may be fixed by the said commission without regard to the provisions of the Act of Congress entitled 'An Act for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services,' approved March 4, 1923, and amendments thereto, or any rule or regulation made in pursuance thereof.

"(c) The commission established by section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide a permanent system of highways in that part of the District of Columbia lying outside of cities' (Twenty-seventh Statutes at Large, pages 532 and 533), known as the Highway Commission, is hereby abolished, and all the functions, powers, and duties conferred and imposed upon said Highway Commission by law are hereby transferred to and conferred and imposed upon the National Capital Park and Planning Commission hereby constituted, and all records of said Highway Commission are hereby transferred to said National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

"(d) All authority, powers, and duties conferred and imposed by law on the National Capital Park Commission shall hereafter be held, exercised, and performed by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission hereby constituted. All appropriations heretofore made for expenditure by the National Capital Park Commission are hereby made available for the use of the commission hereby constituted."

Approved, April 30, 1926.

SECTIONS 2, 3, AND 4 OF THE ACT OF JUNE 6, 1924, WHICH REMAIN UNCHANGED, EXCEPT THAT BY ACT APPROVED FEBRUARY 26, 1925, THE CONTROL OF THE PARK SYSTEM OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IS TRANSFERRED FROM THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS OF THE ARMY TO THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND PUBLIC PARKS OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

SEC. 2. Said commission or a majority thereof is hereby authorized and directed to acquire such lands as in its judgment shall be necessary and desirable in the District of Columbia and adjacent areas in Maryland and Virginia, within the limits of the appropriations made for such purposes, for suitable development of the National Capital park, parkway, and playground system. That said commission is hereby authorized to acquire such lands by purchase when they can be acquired at prices reasonable in the judgment of said commission, otherwise by condemnation proceedings, such proceedings to acquire lands within the District of Columbia to be in accordance with the provisions of the Act of Congress approved August 30, 1890, providing a site for the Government Printing Office (United States Statutes at Large, volume 26, chapter 837), the Chief of Engineers of the Army being, for the purposes of this Act, hereby clothed with all the power vested by the said Act of August 30, 1890, in the board created by that Act. Said commission is hereby authorized to acquire such lands, located in Maryland or Virginia, either by purchase or condemnation proceedings, by such arrangements as to acquisition and payment for the lands as it shall determine upon by agree-

ment with the proper officials of the States of Maryland Virginia. In the selection of lands to be acquired the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts shall be requested. The designation of all lands to be acquired by condemnation, all contracts for purchase of lands, and all agreements between said commission and the officials of the States of Maryland and Virginia shall be subject to the approval of the President of the United States.

SEC. 3. That there is authorized to be appropriated, each year hereafter, in the annual District of Columbia Appropriation Act, a sum not exceeding one cent for each inhabitant of the continental United States as determined by the last preceding decennial census, said sum to be used by said commission for the payment of its expenses and for the acquisition of the lands herein authorized to be acquired by said commission for the purposes named, the compensation for the land, the expense of surveys, ascertainment of title, condemnation proceedings, if any, and necessary conveyancing to be paid from said appropriations. The funds so appropriated shall be paid from the revenues of the District of Columbia and the general funds of the Treasury in the same proportion as other expenses of the District of Columbia. The land so acquired within the District of Columbia shall be a part of the park system of the District of Columbia and be under the control of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army; that areas suitable for playground purposes may, in the discretion of said Commission, be assigned to the control of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for playground purposes. That the land so acquired outside the District of Columbia shall be controlled as determined by agreement between said commission and the proper officers of the States of Maryland and Virginia, such agreements to be subject to the approval of the President.

SEC. 4. Said commission shall report to Congress annually on the first Monday of December the lands acquired during the preceding fiscal year, the method of acquisition, and the cost of each tract. It shall also submit to the Bureau of the Budget on or before September 15 of each year its estimate of the total sum to be appropriated for expenditure under the provisions of this Act during the succeeding fiscal year.

Approved June 6, 1924.

---

[From the Maryland-Washington Metropolitan District Act, Chapter 1008, Laws of Maryland, 1943, published by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission November 1, 1943, pp. 7-8]

IV. In the acquisition and development of land or other property or the exercise of its duties under this Act; and/or for the purposes of complying with the provisions of Paragraphs or Subsections (a) and (b) of Section 1 and/or securing the funds to be appropriated by said Subsections (a) and (b) of Section 1 of an Act of the Congress of the United States known as Public Act 284, Seventy-first Congress, entitled "An Act for the acquisition, establishment and development of The George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington to the Great Falls, and to provide for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital", the Commission may act in conjunction and cooperation with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission created by Act of Congress, approved April 30, 1926, and the Commission is hereby designated by the State of Maryland as the representative of the State of Maryland for these purposes; and for these purposes the Commission is hereby authorized and empowered to enter into such commitments and agreements with the said National Capital Park and Planning Commission as may in the discretion of the Commission seem necessary. * * *

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you, Mr. Nolen. I believe that concludes the testimony from the Maryland Planning Commission.

I have a letter here from Mr. Lundberg of the Arlington County Board. Without objection, his letter to me and a statement by the Arlington County Board will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

OFFICE OF COUNTY MANAGER,
*Arlington, Va., February 1, 1951.*

Hon. JAMES W. TRIMBLE,
*Chairman, House Committee on H. R. 1272,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Attached hereto are the statements prepared by the County Board of Arlington County, Va., which were submitted to the Senate committee holding hearings on Senate bill S. 218. These statements are being forwarded to you for your committee's use in the hearing on H. R. 1272, which is a companion bill to S. 218.

Will you kindly advise the writer whether or not representatives of the county board should appear at the hearings on this bill and, if so, at what time and place.

Very truly yours,

A. T. LUNDBERG, *County Manager.*

STATEMENT BY THE ARLINGTON COUNTY BOARD ON SENATE BILL S. 218, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

(February 1 revision to January 30, 1951, statement)

ARLINGTON COUNTY AND THE FEDERAL OFFICES DISPERSAL PROGRAM

By the very nature of the site specifications so far made public with respect to the proposed dispersal and decentralization plan, Arlington County does not anticipate the location of a Federal installation within the county limits. Neither the distance nor time requirements can be met locally, and few open buildable sites of suitable size remain available. Therefore, the county is not reviewing its facilities with the thought of providing for such an installation.

However, Arlington will be directly affected by the proposed dispersal even though the sites are beyond her boundaries. Preliminary studies indicate that the major resultant factors influencing the future of the county include the following: Transportation routes and facilities, water supply and sanitation, and future regional land-use patterns, with emphasis on zoning and park development.

It is granted that Arlington County is a corridor area, as well as a residential community, since all routes across the Potomac into the District of Columbia pass through the county. It is also acknowledged that limited-access highways will be essential between the Capital and the satellite offices. One such limited-access highway (Shirley Highway, Route 350) exists through the county, going in a southwestern direction. Another highway, leading to the west (Lee Boulevard, Route 50), can be readily converted to limited-access use. George Washington Memorial Parkway, now under construction, offers a future radial thoroughfare to the north. The continued development of Arlington Mill Drive along Four-Mile Run will give a limited-access cross-county connection from Alexandria and the National Airport direct to U. S. Route 50. The location for such a highway in a northwesterly direction, connecting with Route 7, must be studied. However, these highways must not be permitted to become traffic sluiceways which would isolate Arlington completely from passing traffic or would divide the county into unconnected parts. These highways will profoundly affect the street-use patterns, residential neighborhoods, and commercial developments in the county and could cause blight. Coordination of dispersal communication needs and basic county development is imperative, and must be planned in advance if Arlington is to continue as a healthy dormitory community for Federal employees and as a home community for its permanent residents.

Water supply and sanitation for these dispersal sites will also affect Arlington. The burden placed on regional resources and facilities by the proposed installations, added to the problems of the joint regional effort now under study, will need careful analysis to assure equitable distribution between the old and the new communities. Civil defense requirements necessitate an ample and constant water supply, and prudence will require a separate source independent of the District of Columbia. This problem particularly affects Arlington, now getting all of its water by pipe across Chain Bridge from the Federal water supply. Regional water sources should be developed in close cooperation between the dispersal-sites engineers and the neighboring Virginia communities to provide ample and reserve supplies for all and to prevent either unnecessary supply duplication or vulnerable

distribution systems. Regional sewage disposal must be solved so that a breakdown anywhere will not result in pollution and possible pestilence in the adjoining areas.

Regional land-use patterns, as they develop under the stimulus of decentralization, are of great interest to Arlington. Haphazard control, with resulting string developments, will result in placing greater loads on local highways and make for uneconomic elongation of the water and sewer facilities of all the existing communities. This will hold true also for school facilities and police and fire protection. Furthermore, Arlington is concerned with the provision of regional parks and open spaces, not only because of their recognized place in living conditions but also because of their vital role in civil defense by providing evacuation and shelter areas. Arlington County is rapidly approaching a state of completely urban development, and this urbanization is spreading across and beyond its boundaries. As a result, sufficient open space will not be available within or immediately adjacent to the county to provide the necessary dispersal areas for the local citizens in time of emergency. It is vital that these areas be provided at not too great a distance from the county line. Also, local parkway access must be provided to permit wholesale evacuation in all directions, unhampered by narrow bottlenecks through random, uncontrolled housing developments. It is mandatory that the local communities, with State assistance and Federal cooperation, develop and exercise strong zoning and subdivision controls, under the supervision of active local planning agencies, to secure the required orderly and open developments indicated.

It is understood that, in speaking of the needs of the dispersal sites, these needs include the probable private developments that will automatically follow the completion of the Federal installations. An immediate demand will arise from the Federal personnel for more conveniently located housing, and future planning must anticipate accelerated new community growth, with concurrent utility and facility requirements.

Although these housing developments may not be within this county, Arlington distinctly feels that good planning is an essential factor in providing for those oft-stated rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Therefore, it cannot be too strongly stressed that basic coordinated planning is required by Federal, State, and local authorities in order to achieve the maximum amenities for living and work, and, possibly, survival, not only adjacent to the actual dispersed building sites but within the entire metropolitan region.

Arlington County supports the recommendation of the Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission that Federal funds be made available under S. 218 to the several local governments for advance and detailed planning studies on the effects to be anticipated by the dispersal and the optimum solutions, so that the final regional development can be guided in an orderly and economic fashion.

Reference has been made to the provisions of Senate bill 349, the proposed Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as the medium through which financial assistance could be made available to political subdivisions whose economic development would be affected by the provisions of S. 218. A review of S. 349 reveals that it is broad in scope, and that the provisions might possibly be interpreted or construed to include assistance of the type it is believed Arlington County and other local communities should have for planning facilities and services incident to the proposed dispersal plan and which it is believed should be extended to any political subdivision whose normal economy may be affected by the proposed decentralization program. However, S. 349 is limited to community facilities and services in areas in which defense housing is required. This immediately raises the question of (*a*) whether or not S. 218 is to be construed or specifically defined as a defense measure, (*b*) whether community facilities and services which ovbiously will be consequent to the dispersal and decentralization program will be defined as an integral part of defense housing, and (*c*) whether the term "areas" will not be limited to the immediate vicinity of the defense housing, without regard to the abnormal economic impact on the region surrounding the immediate defense areas. Furthermore, S. 349 contains no provision for grants to potentially affected political subdivisions for planning purposes. It is therefore submitted that for the protection of the taxpayers in such political subdivisions, consideration should be given either to making S. 218 financially self-sufficient or to requiring a concurrent study of S. 218 and S. 349 to insure that they are financially complementary. It is believed the recommendation made at the hearing January 30 that the first sentence of section 3 of S. 218 be amended by adding after the word "act" the words "and for grants-in-aid for over-all planning purposes to political sub-

divisions whose economic development is affected by the provisions of this Act," supplies an initial step to make the proposed act self-sufficient, and that the study suggested above may reveal the necessity for further amendment if the potentialities of the program are to be looked upon as a national financial obligation rather than that of individual political subdivisions which are the legatees of its provisions.

To crystallize the above considerations into definite form for possible action, a suggested amendment to the basic S. 218 is herewith presented for review and concurrence by the Subcommittee on Public Buildings, Senate Committee on Public Works. This amendment can either be made a part of the first section or become section 2:

"To protect the said sites, their installations and communications from encroachments and disorderly development that may reduce their usefulness as intended by the Congress, and to promote the health and welfare of both the local communities affected by this program and that of the Federal personnel assigned to the installations, the Administrator of General Services is directed to work with the appropriate State and local authorities and to take such action as may be deemed necessary to establish comprehensive planning and such land-use control as permitted under existing State enabling legislation to the end that economic and equitable distribution of facilities and services can be achieved in the metropolitan region and orderly development accomplished on the private lands surrounding or adjacent to the said buildings, highways, and off-site facilities authorized under this Act. The Administrator of General Services is further directed to make grants-in-aid from such moneys as may be appropriated herein to the several local authorities to assist in such over-all planning studies as may be additionally necessitated by said Federal building dispersal: *Provided*, That no moneys so granted shall be used for building, housing, or facility design or construction."

The Arlington County Board will seek an opportunity to be heard by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency while S. 349 is under consideration, but without too much optimism over the probability of its eventually containing specific provision for the assistance believed needed in connection with the activities contemplated under S. 218, or over the enactment of S. 349 in such time or shape as to assure concurrent orderly economic development without an undue burden on the taxpayers of Arlington.

(Mrs.) Florence Cannon,
*Chairman, Arlington County Board.*

---

Statement by the County Board of Arlington County, Va., Before the United States Committee on Public Works in Regard to Bill S. 218, Eighty-second Congress, Providing for the Construction of Federal Buildings Outside of, but in Vicinity of, the District of Columbia

ARLINGTON COUNTY AND THE FEDERAL OFFICES DISPERSAL PROGRAM

By the very nature of the site specifications so far made public, Arlington County does not anticipate the location of a Federal office center within the county limits. Neither the distance nor time requirements can be met locally, and few open buildable sites of suitable size remain available. Therefore, the county is not reviewing its facilities with the thought of providing for such an installation.

However, Arlington will be directly affected by the proposed dispersal even though the sites are beyond her boundaries. Preliminary studies indicate that the major resultant factors influencing the future of the county include the following: transportation routes, water supply and sanitation, future regional land-use patterns, with emphasis on zoning and park development.

It is granted that Arlington County is a corridor area, as well as a residential community, since all routes across the Potomac into the District of Columbia pass through the county. It is also acknowledged that limited access highways will be essential between the Capital and the satellite offices. Shirley Highway exists as an immediately available limited-access thoroughfare. Lee Boulevard can fairly readily be converted into the same. George Washington Memorial Parkway offers a future radial thoroughfare to the north. The continued development of Arlington Mill Drive will give a limited-access cross-county connection from Alexandria and the National Airport direct to Lee Boulevard. However, these highways must not be permitted to become traffic sluiceways that isolate Arlington completely from passing traffic or that divide the county into uncon-

nected parts. These highways will profoundly affect the street use patterns, residential neighborhoods, and commercial developments in the county and could cause blight. Coordination of dispersal communication needs and basic county development is imperative.

Water supply and sanitation for these dispersal sites will also affect Arlington. The burden placed on regional resources and facilities by the large decentralized offices, added to the problems of joint regional effort now under study, will need careful analysis to promote equitable distribution between the old and new communities. Civil defense requirements necessitate ample and constant water supply, and prudence will require a separate source independent of the District of Columbia. This problem particularly affects Arlington, now getting all of its water by pipe from the District. Regional supplies should be developed in close cooperation between the dispersal sites engineers and the neighboring Virginia communities to prevent either unnecessary supply duplication or vulnerable distribution systems.

Regional land use patterns, as they develop under the stimulus of decentralization, are of great interest to Arlington. Haphazard control, with resulting string developments, will result in placing greater loads on local highways and make for uneconomic elongation of the water and sewer facilities of all the existing communities. This will hold true also for school facilities and a police and fire protection. Further, Arlington is concerned with the provision of regional parks and open spaces. These can have a vital role in civil defense by providing evacuation and shelter areas. Arlington County is rapidly approaching a state of completely urban development and this urbanization is spreading across and beyond its boundaries. As a result, sufficient open space will not be available within or immediately adjacent to the county to provide the necessary dispersal areas for the local citizens in time of emergency. It is vital that these areas be provided at not too great a distance from the county line. Likewise, parkway access must be provided to permit wholesale evacuation in all directions, unhampered by narrow bottlenecks through random uncontrolled housing developments. It is mandatory that the local communities, with State assistance and Federal cooperation, develop and exercise strong zoning and subdivision controls, under the supervision of active local planning agencies to secure the required orderly and open developments indicated.

It is understood that, in speaking of the needs of the dispersal sites, these needs include the probable private developments that will automatically follow the completion of the Federal office facilities. An immediate demand will arise from the Federal personnel for more conveniently located housing and any future planning must anticipate accelerated new community growth, with concurrent utility and facility requirements.

The above observations form only an advance memorandum of some of the more important influences that will affect the future of Arlington County. A more detailed and comprehensive study and report is being developed.

Meanwhile, Arlington County supports the recommendation of the Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission that Federal funds be made available to the several local governments for advance and detail planning studies, so that the final regional development can be guided in an orderly and economic fashion.

ARLINGTON COUNTY BOARD,
FLORENCE CANNON, *Chairman.*

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Morris Kanfer. Will you please state your name for the committee.

## STATEMENT OF MORRIS KANFER, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. KANFER. My name is Morris Kanfer. I am an attorney practicing in Washington, D. C. I was formerly with the chief counsel's office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Prior to that I was an assistant United States attorney in the southern district of New York.

At the outset I want to put the members of this committee at ease by stating that I am not asking for any appropriations or any funds, or advocating anything that would require the expenditure of money at this time. On the contrary, I hope that my proposal, if adopted, might result in a further reduction of the appropriation requested by

General Services Administration by modifying the dispersal plan without in any way jeopardizing the principal objective of the plan, which is to assure the continuity of the principal functions of government in the event of an attack.

I have a statement here I would like to read, and then I would like to supplement that with some additional facts.

The revised dispersal plan reducing the sites from eight to six resulted in a reduction of $45,000,000 in the appropriation requested. It is entirely possible that a further substantial reduction in the appropriation requested can be achieved without jeopardizing the program for securing the continuity of important Government functions in the event of an attack.

Testimony before the Senate subcommittee hearing on January 30, 1951, indicated that of the 40,000 persons to be dispersed, 25,000 are related to the defense departments and the remaining 15,000 are personnel of departments other than defense. It is respectfully submitted that these 15,000 civilian personnel can be dispersed to suitable underground office space to be constructed in the outlying areas within the District of Columbia.

The dispersal bill under consideration by this committee fails to take into consideration the feasibility of housing Government personnel in protective underground office buildings in the outlying sections of the District, removed from the White House approximately 4 to 5 miles. The General Services Administration has been offered such an office building to be constructed large enough to house 4,000 Government personnel, at a site on Connecticut Avenue at Albemarle Street NW., where a natural ravine runs through the property, making it ideally suitable for the construction of such a building. The building would be constructed in accordance with the recommendations of the Civil Defense Administration for protective quarters to secure the occupants in the event of a bombing attack and such facilities would thus be available to the citizens of the District as emergency bomb shelters without requiring the District to expend millions of dollars to provide separate shelters under the civil-defense program.

Some confusion as to policy concerning the construction of an underground office building in the District of Columbia has been evidenced in my discussions with various Government officials. I am advised that the National Security Resources Board has approved the principle of dispersal, decentralization, and underground protective space—all three, as the proper means of obtaining greater security for Government personnel and thus permitting the continuity of Government functions in event of an attack. Obviously the greater number of Government employees are to remain in Washington and these would be safer in an underground office building than in apartment houses on Massachusetts Avenue.

May I interrupt my statement at this time to state that this confusion of policy ought to be cleared up for the reason that even the members of the press failed to grasp the significance of Colonel Potts' testimony yesterday afternoon when the chairman asked him, as I recall it, specifically what is the Government's policy with respect to underground shelters. As I recall it he said in the testimony something to the effect that the National Security Resources Board Committee had at one time stated that Washington terrain was not suitable for such

underground space in the District that it did not mean that there are not other areas in Washington away from the downtown area where the terrain would permit such construction. I think he said it is conceivable that in those areas you could combine Government work space with bomb shelters but that they would leave it to the General Services Administration in the selection of such sites in the District.

In one of the morning papers here I noted it said that Mr. Potts testified that the National Security Resources Board had dropped as impractical a proposal to build combination underground working space and bomb shelters in Washington. That might factually be a correct statement, but since it is not adequate it conveyed, I am sure, the wrong impression.

On December 10, 1950, Mr. Jess Larson, testifying before this subcommittee, stated that the underground citadels used by the British Government to carry on its functions were designed to withstand the impact of 200-pound bombs, but before the war was over they had to adjust them to meet the impact of 2,000-pound bombs. Mr. Larson further stated that the reasons we were not considering similar underground citadels for Washington was because it was believed that the Washington terrain was unsuited for constructing such citadels, and also because it would be too costly to provide such protective facilities for the 40,000 people to be dispersed.

This committee's attention is called to the fact that the Washington terrain does permit the construction of protective underground facilities in some areas away from the downtown section of Washington. For example, the altitude of the Connecticut Avenue and Albemarle Street site is approximately 260 to 300 feet above sea level. That site is particularly suitable for the construction of such underground facilities without great difficulty and without any exhorbitant expense. It is estimated by the contractors who are planning the construction of the underground building on this site that it would cost a little more to build an office building underground than it would cost to build it above ground where the site does not require much excavation.

It is suggested this committee consider the feasibility of modifying the dispersal program by moving out of the District 25,000 personnel offices instead of 40,000 and leaving the remaining 15,000 civilian personnel offices dispersed in underground office facilities scattered throughout the District of Columbia, removed from the White House a distance of 4 to 5 miles.

In order to privately finance the construction of an underground office building, which would be leased to the Government, however, it is necessary to obtain from General Services Administration a 10-year lease for such facilities, whereas its present statutory authority to lease property within the District of Columbia is limited to 1 year.

It is, therefore, suggested that the dispersal bill, H. R. 1728, under consideration by this committee, be amended to authorize and direct the Administrator to enter into long-term leases for the use of emergency underground facilities in this general area.

The utilization of such underground facilities by the Federal Government as office space in lieu of such space it now occupies in rented apartment houses in the District would not only provide greater protection for Government personnel, but would release these apartment houses for housing use, the sole purpose for which they were designed

and built. Such underground facilities would thus become available in case of need as bomb shelters for District residents. The District would otherwise be required to incur substantial expense in constructing separate bomb shelters under the civil-defense program, or do without such shelters.

At this point I might say that I have been in contact with the Federal Civil Defense Administration and with the District Civil Defense Administration, to whom this plan of mine has great appeal, particularly since the District does not have any funds for the construction of separate underground bomb shelters even if they had the plans.

The principal objective of the dispersal plan is to provide better protection for Government personnel, thereby assuring the continuity of important Government functions in the event of attack. The primary function of the Civil Defense Administration is to provide bomb-shelter protection for civilians in the event of attack. Both objectives are so similar that it seems logical to combine, whenever and wherever possible, the methods of providing for the safety of Government personnel as well as of civilians, within the framework of the same structures, thus saving many millions of dollars by avoiding the duplication of such structures.

It is estimated that the rental cost to the Federal Government for such protective underground office space would be no greater than it now pays as rent for office space in apartment houses on Massachusetts Avenue, which they have recently taken over. The successful completion of such a project in the District might well set a pattern for utilizing similar underground space in other cities where the Government is occupying a good deal of space for Government offices and for civilian bomb shelters in the event of an emergency.

The following amendment to H. R. 1728 is respectfully submitted for this committee's consideration: No appropriation is requested, gentlemen.

SECTION 1 (a). The Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to contract for and acquire, on long-term leases not to exceed 10-year terms, emergency underground facilities within the District of Columbia and surrounding area suitable for office space and other uses, to be assigned to Government departments and agencies, provided plans for such underground facilities are either prepared or approved by General Services Administration or any other governmental agency having similar jurisdiction over such space and providing also such plans are approved in advance of construction by the Civil Defense Administration, or appropriate State, district or regional director thereof, with respect to that portion of building to be used as general bomb shelters in event of emergency.

I might say that I have made a similar statement as this, though not exactly, for the Senate subcommittee over which Senator Holland presided as the chairman. It was rather gratifying to me to have him state at the conclusion of my statement in substance that there was meat to my proposal and that he would request the General Services Administration—Mr. Reynolds was there at the time—to look into the technical feasibility of it. That is where the matter stands.

Now, I have listened to the testimony of the witnesses here today and all day yesterday. Frankly, as a person who has perhaps a private interest to protect, my observations might be considered prejudiced, but I assure you gentlemen that I am offering this suggestion as a general program and not with respect to the utilization of this

particular site at Connecticut Avenue and Albermarle Street, which I happen to own. I think it is a program which is sound, particularly in view of some of the comments of some of the Congressmen here. If this is an emergency program we ought to take steps to protect the civilian and Government personnel. If it is not an emergency program then the whole dispersal program is not necessary.

There is a great deal of controversy in the minds of some of the people as to whether it is or is not necessary to disperse. I think there is always a compromise and a half-way mark where we could adopt a dispersal program but make it easier for the outlying communities to digest the impact of so many people coming to their community at one time. It may have taken years to build up a little village of 5,000 or 6,000 people, and here we are attempting to dump in on them in a year or 18 months 5,000 people in the locality. Therefore, it may be common horse sense, if I may use that parlance, since I too come from the farm area of up-State New York, to adopt a modified program and disperse a fewer number of people. It does not have to be 40,000. Then you do not have the terrible impact in the communities at large. At the same time you will be satisfying those who advocate dispersal in the interest of either safety or because they need more space.

As Mr. Davis pointed out yesterday, there seems to be still a considerable difference of opinion as to whether this is primarily a safety program or a space program. Regardless of that, it appears sensible that if they need space they could put some of it out in some outlying areas. I am not opposed to the dispersal program, but I say that we should modify it, particularly when it is not necessary to take 40,000 people and move them out and uproot their families and disperse the area when we can at the same time give them protective facilities. Let the Government rent underground office space instead of space over the ground. It will cost no more.

I hope we never have to use it, but in a time of emergency the time might come when we all would thank God that we had some Government facilities for these important things, even if the whole dispersal program is not adopted.

That is all.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you. Mr. Scudder?

Mr. SCUDDER. I am sorry I was not present to hear the entire testimony, but are the locations available that you have in mind, where these underground locations could be built? Would they be built by private enterprise and leased to the Government for the duration of the emergency?

Mr. KANFER. That is precisely the point, Mr. Scudder. I am sorry that you missed the early part of the testimony. I stated that we have offered such a proposal to the General Services Administration as long as 3 months ago. I happen to own one such site at Connecticut Avenue and Albemarle Street. It had been a nursery farm for 50 years. I bought it since I wanted a farm in Washington instead of just a lot. It had a great big gulley through it and terrain that would be extremely difficult to develop for anything else other than a huge apartment project with three or four stories underground.

We had that kind of a plan under consideration for more than 6 months. One of the contractors who has been building for the

Government buildings, Mr. Miatico (?), whose apartment house on Massachusetts Avenue the General Services Administration has just taken over for office space, is a man who contemplated the construction of an 800-unit apartment house on our site. Three months ago when I got those inspection reports the General Services were so desperately seeking more office space in the District, I went to the General Services Administration and offered this proposal and said that in view of the emergency it might be logical to lease the underground space under this huge apartment house. Some of the men said that there was a rather novel idea, but a very good idea, but they said their hands were tied. They had statutory authority to lease in the District of Columbia limited to 1 year. Obviously we could not possibly get financing from the insurance companies.

This is a project that would be built and financed entirely by private people. We are offering it to the General Services Administration on a long-term lease so that it will be possible to get the financing from the insurance companies.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Larcade?

Mr. LARCADE. I just have one observation to make. The Government could just as well purchase these sites that you mention and construct these buildings itself.

Mr. KANFER. That is correct, but apparently the General Services Administration has seen fit to adopt a policy 6 months ago that they would not construct any more new buildings of their own in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LARCADE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. George?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no questions.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. That would be a pretty difficult parking situation out there, would it no, Mr. Kanfer?

Mr. KANFER. Not at all, because we would have 200,000 square feet of area for parking. As we visualize this now, the underground facilities would be built up level with Connecticut Avenee, and the entire area, which would be the roof of that four-story building, would be level on grade with Connecticut Avenue with 200,000 square feet of parking. In addition to that, the Government does own another acre or two which is immediately adjacent to that, that extends over to Chesapeake Street, which they acquired years ago for a playground. Apparently that area has been built up with grown-ups rather than children and it has not been used. The Government could utilize that additional space for parking, if necessary.

Mr. DAVIS. I know that site. Whatever you do out there you will have to go underground; and there is no question about that.

Mr. KANFER. Correct. That is the very purpose for which the plan was originated. It was just an idea, but like many other things, they germinate. Six months ago I was very timid about suggesting it. I thought it would be denounced as impractical, but the Civil Defense Organization, both the Federal and District, thought it was a grand idea and would like to see it done. It would be one of the outstanding examples of one Government agency cooperating with another and at the same time saving the District millions of dollars.

Mr. DAVIS. I think it might be well to talk to the General Services Administration people about it. It is quite an idea.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Pickett?

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Kanfer, I was interested in your suggestion from the standpoint of the estimated cost of this. Have you any gross figure that you can tell us as to the estimated cost of such a four-story structure?

Mr. KANFER. If you will bear with me I have Mr. Lepley here, the architect who planned and worked on this. He is scheduled to appear after I am. With your permission he can give those figures.

Mr. PICKETT. He can give us the figures. Just what is the reason, assuming this is as good an idea as you present it to be, that somebody does not go ahead and produce the goods, construct the underground building and tender it for occupancy? I will bet you will find somebody is willing to rent it.

Mr. KANFER. I think you are absolutely right, Mr. Pickett. The General Services Administration people suggested last November, when I first contacted them, that if this project were under construction it would be a juicy morsel to them, as they put it, but unfortunately I do not have the millions to put into this thing. We would have to go to an insurance company for financing. They are the principal source of private funds for mortgage loans, as you know. They are getting about $1,000,000,000 a month in, and they are seeking outlets.

Just as somebody observed, the people who have the purse strings are the people who can dictate terms. I heard that observation this this morning. The insurance companies have the purse strings, and we would have to conform to their requirements. Their requirements are that if we get a 10-year lease from the Government they will finance it. There is no practical way of starting this unless we have an indication from the General Services Administration that they will consider our project in rental. We cannot start until then, but we could probably get the steam shovels going in a couple of weeks, perhaps.

Mr. PICKETT. What you mean is that you would have to get a 10-year commitment for occupancy and rental payment before you could get the construction funds.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KANFER. That is correct.

Mr. DAVIS. If you are going to build a warehouse-type building, just as soon as you get the building completed Mr. Reynolds will take it over.

Mr. KANFER. I agree with you, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. He will go out and take it over right away.

Mr. KANFER. He testified yesterday here, I think, that there is not 25,000 square feet of space available in the District.

Mr. DAVIS. That is right.

Mr. KANFER. Furthermore, under our program we are just talking about 600,000 square feet of office space entirely underground. Our plans were to build an eight-story apartment house above it, with another 400,000 square feet of space, so we could offer 1,000,000 square feet of building, and the people occupying the upstairs apartments could go downstairs in the event of emergency.

We need somebody to start the steam shovels going and that is the reason I am here, gentlemen.

Mr. PICKETT. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Blatnik?

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Kanfer, you stated that the estimated cost to the Federal Government for these underground offices would be equivalent to what is now being paid in rent in the District. Does that mean in rent or equivalent office space?

Mr. KANFER. That is correct. That is per square foot. They rent it on a square-foot basis.

Mr. BLATNIK. You estimate, with this proposed site as an example, that you would have 600,000 square feet available underground?

Mr. KANFER. That is right.

Mr. BLATNIK. You have figures which your architect will submit later on?

Mr. KANFER. Yes.

Mr. BLATNIK. To substantiate the statement that it would not cost the Government any more?

Mr. KANFER. That is correct.

Mr. BLATNIK. Than it does now for office space.

Mr. KANFER. I do not know what they are paying now. Mr. Reynolds can tell you. One of the properties on Massachusetts Avenue runs some $2 to $3 per square foot per year. The underground facilities should not cost that much. Even if this entire dispersal plan were adopted in full, it still makes good sense to take people out of apartment houses on Massachusetts Avenue, when the owners want those buildings back for housing, anyway, and take the very same people with the Navy or some other important Government function and give them the space underground, removed 4 or 5 miles from the target area.

This is not in conflict with the dispersal plan, gentlemen. I want to emphasize that.

Mr. BLATNIK. Are these underground offices more permanent in nature, or are they of emergency type?

Mr. KANFER. The use of them perhaps would be emergency, because we are in an emergency period. We are in an atomic age. However, they would be permanent, of course. They would have to be built very sturdily, in conformance with the civil defense requirement. They would be built of reinforced concrete. We have discussed those things with the civil defense people.

Incidentally, may I interrupt at this point to say that they would also contemplate having their own water supply from artesian wells, and their own electric power, stand-by service, so that in the event of emergency they can continue to operate as a separate unit.

Mr. BLATNIK. The reason I asked is that I have never heard of nor seen any permanent underground office space, except storage, where the people work in the normal pursuit of their activities. Do you know of any such building, either private or governmental?

Mr. KANFER. Yes; I do. A number of years ago I had an opportunity to visit the Federal Reserve bank in New York. I recall that we got into an elevator at the street floor and we went down four or five or perhaps six stories underground. The Federal Reserve bank is built exactly like that. They have their funds, and many of the people work there regularly. I think that has been there for 20 years.

Mr. BLATNIK. Did you contact any other agency besides the General Services Administration?

Mr. KANFER. No; we did not, because under the procedure there, and I believe under the act, the General Services Administration is what they themselves call the real-estate brokers for the Government. All the requirements for Government space are centralized through the General Services Administration. If other Government agencies were to call upon them for space it is their duty to go out and find the space.

I confess this is a new idea which I should like to have you people explore if it is feasible.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, this proposition, in view of the fact that we are already spending that money for rent, and that it would not cost any more than that to have this office space available, which also could be used for a bomb shelter, and which would thereby also relieve some additional housing, appeals to me. I hope that it may be possible to get a memorandum from the General Services Administration on this, as well as from other agencies such as the Civilian Defense Agency and the National Security Resources Board and others who are involved in this, if they cannot testify. Time does not allow for that, but perhaps we could get a memorandum which could be used in our executive session, to see the reaction of the official agencies to this proposal.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Kanfer.

Mr. Lepley, you may state your full name and identify yourself for the record, if you please?

## STATEMENT OF MATTHEW G. LEPLEY, ARCHITECT, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. LEPLEY. My name is Matthew G. Lepley, Mr. Chairman. I am named after the last mayor Washington ever had.

Mr. TRIMBLE. We are glad to have you with us. Go right ahead.

Mr. LEPLEY. I am an architect, gentlemen, 65 years of age, a native of Washington. I have been in construction and architecture since I got out of college, when I was 20 years old. From that standpoint, I have witnessed since my boyhood the growth of this great city.

I have had a great deal of experience in the building business, mostly for private capital. In 1917, I was transferred from Camp Belvoir, which was then Camp Humphries, to the Bureau of Yards and Docks, and as an architect helped to develop one of our temporary structures on Constitution Avenue, the Munitions and the Navy Building, which we built of reinforced concrete.

I have listened with interest to these hearings both on the Senate side and here on this side of the Capitol; and, gentlemen, this is a very serious matter. This Government of ours has grown to such proportions that it is inevitable that it be expanded. Congested as we are due to our limited 10 square miles, we nevertheless house the government of the world and 2,000,000 people, and in addition to that no less than what seems to be a half a million automobiles.

The question of parking the automobile is alone a very serious problem. For comparison, I ask you to look at the planning and the forethought that was given to the area between the Capitol and the Union Station, the underground parking facilities that were provided by our far-seeing architects at the time, and compare this to the Pentagon, where we destroyed natural facilities for underground parking that would have preserved the landscape of the community. And look at

the hazardous condition that we have there now. We don't need to be worried about the atomic bomb: sabotage in the middle of those 10,000 automobiles there at the Pentagon could block every highway that the military would have to travel between Washington and Virginia. It is serious. There should be planning, and something should be done about it that will be of a permanent nature.

There is a need for relief at once. How quick these out-bound offices can be erected now, in this emergency, is another question. It is a tremendous undertaking and should be measured from the standpoint of need. If the necessity here now is an emergency, the quicker we can find locations to house these Government agencies that we must protect, the better. It is a matter of time. I hope in this instance that we are not attacked before we are ready.

In the meanwhile, there are several things that we can do. And again I say, quickly! We can take advantage of several sites around the city, some within 5 miles or 6 miles of Washington. One that I have in mind especially is out near the Walter Reed Hospital at Forest Glen, right alongside of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. There is a terrain there, a piece of property containing 50 acres of ground, where an underground shelter, an office building, could be erected within a matter of 4 or 5 months. No one will have to be discommoded by having to leave Washington. The Baltimore & Ohio trains at Union Station could take whatever number of people we needed from this point directly to the spot at Forest Glen. The railroad siding is there, the water is there, the sewer is there, the telephone communications are there, and all other necessary commodities, which it takes time to build and time to get.

Now, if this is an emergency, we haven't got time to stop and buy Tom Hicks' farm 6 miles out or a farm 20 miles out and build a water line out there, build telephone lines, provide sewers, highways, that are going to be necessary to make it a permanent proposition. If we are going to do that, and if that is the plan, these shelters should be included in those structures, so that the communities in which they are built could provide a dual purpose. The civilian in this proposition needs protection. He is the Government worker and should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Kanfer's property, and there are several others in these locations, are owned by men who can and will build at once underground office space, with a great deal of resultant relief to our congested areas. But the GSA has no power to lease for a longer period than 1 year, which is a draw-back to the private capital investor. If the General Services Administration were empowered to lease here or elsewhere for a term of years, not to exceed 10, I am sure that private capital would provide the needed space for this agency within 6 months, which would relieve the Government of an expenditure which is beyond all calculation. We don't know whether this thing is going to cost $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 or $150,000,000,000. You buy a piece of property, and the first thing you do is make a soil test. You may not strike water. You say you are going to have a well, you hope. You can drill anywhere from a hundred to two hundred feet in some instances, and you get no water. In some places you get water in 50 feet, but it is contaminated; it is too close to the top. Those are things that must be taken into consideration. It takes time to plan these things if they are going to be of permanent nature.

I think that it would be safe for us to consolidate our efforts and maybe condense our vulnerable areas, and not invite the saturation bombing of our entire surrounding community. The question, I think, is not that we have to disperse. We do. But is it necessary to undertake so large a dispersal at this time? This is an emergency, and as such I think we should treat it that way.

Thank you.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Lepley.

Mr. George?

Mr. GEORGE. Have you gone into this proposed site that the gentleman just testified about?

Mr. LEPLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it very feasible and practical to build there?

Mr. LEPLEY. Definitely. Today, with air conditioning and fluorescent lighting, there are numbers and numbers of buildings throughout the United States that have been built without windows. As an example I might cite Hecht's Department Store in Silver Spring. Then there is the Hershey Building in Pennsylvania, one of the new office buildings, which has not a window in it from the basement to the roof except the air intake.

The air-conditioning equipment and fluorescent lighting can be handled in these underground structures with independent water supply, stand-by energy electrical equipment. In fact, in the bulletin that we have from the Atomic Energy Commission, which was printed for the Security Resources Board, their recommendations are for underground structures, and they give us details of the things to provide. One of them is water. There are chemical toilets, in the event that the sewerage systems are destroyed or for some reason get out of commission. There are electrical stand-by generators operated either with carbide gas or with oil Diesel engines. That makes an underground structure independent of any utilities, or any need for utilities that the Government will have to provide.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Larcade?

Mr. LARCADE. No questions.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. As a matter of fact, some of these buildings without windows provide fresher and cleaner air than other buildings, do they not? Do they not wash the air?

Mr. LEPLEY. The air is washed and dried, yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. And you do not have noise in such buildings.

Mr. LEPLEY. The day is coming when that is going to be the acceptable proposition. If you have lived in Washington, as I have, you know that old man sinus gets ahead of you sometimes.

Mr. DAVIS. Sinus in the winter and heat in the summer.

Mr. LEPLEY. And with these headaches that you get at 100° temperature, when you can fry eggs on the sidewalks at Ninth and F Streets, you then wish you were indoors without windows.

Mr. DAVIS. I agree with you.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The Chair does not know about sinus, but the committee has plenty of headaches, here.

Mr. Pickett?

Mr. PICKETT. The illustration has been used of the Connecticut Avenue and Albemarle Street site. As I understand it, that is a location where there is a lot of natural drainage.

Mr. LEPLEY. Yes.

Mr. PICKETT. You would have some difficulty, would you not, in taking care of that drainage, with that kind of a structure in the place?

Mr. LEPLEY. No, sir. The grade at the top of Brandywine Street and Connecticut Avenue is an elevation of 273. That means it is 273 feet above sea level. At Albermarle Street and Connecticut Avenue, the elevation is 243. There is a drop of 30 feet. The bottom of the lowest part of this property is 200. The sewer in Albermarle Street is 40 feet below the street level. In my preliminary studies, there, we found it was necessary to drive piles. I planned and built the apartment at the next corner, at Chesapeake Street, and we drove piles there. We struck water at elevation 40. The construction of piles, with a grade beam and pile caps, would bring us 13 feet above the 200 mark; so that we would be at least 10 feet above the sewer in Albermarle Street, which is there now, at the lowest point.

Mr. PICKETT. How far underground would you have to go with a four-story building?

Mr. LEPLEY. The stories are 10 feet each, sir.

Mr. PICKETT. Now, then, I take it that what you have in mind here is a building that would take care of some four to five thousand people for employment; is that right?

Mr. LEPLEY. Yes, sir. The number of square feet that are in what is available now, unexcavated, to put the building in the hole, is approximately 200,000 square feet. Four stories of that would mean 800,000 square feet of floor space.

I heard you ask the question about the cost, sir; and that would mean 8,000,000 cubic feet in that four stories underground. The superstructure above it would also have 8,000,000 cubic feet. That would be a total of 16,000,000 cubic feet in the entire project, or $16,000,000 cost, $8,000,000 for the underground structure and $8,000,000 for the overground.

Mr. PICKETT. Would you not compound your traffic difficulties considerably on Connecticut Avenue with that type of a structure there?

Mr. LEPLEY. No, sir. The entrance to that property comes up from the park. We can take it from Brandywine Street. We have entrances on all four sides. And the square-foot area that I gave you, sir, available for the office building, is outside of the part contemplated for the apartment, under the apartment, to be used as garage space.

So, as Mr. Kanfer said, you can park your car, you can work downstairs and live upstairs, and you can have your car right in the same building. It is pretty much like the office building we have just had built on I Street here between Sixteenth and Seventeenth. You can drive up to the fifth floor and get out. Your car is parked. You go through a door, and you go into your office. We can provide the same facilities here on this area.

Mr. PICKETT. Thank you, Mr. Lepley.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Blatnik?

Mr. BLATNIK. Will you repeat what Government-owned buildings we now have that have no windows?

Mr. LEPLEY. I didn't make such a statement, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. I am sorry. I thought you were referring to some buildings that are becoming more and more popular.

Mr. LEPLEY. Well, I mentioned the Hershey Building in Pennsylvania and the Hecht's department store here in Silver Spring, Md., which is very close by. That is one of our newest-type department stores. In fact, the trend has been, lately, in construction, not to provide outside windows in commercial properties. With the use of air conditioning and fluorescent lighting, we don't need it.

Mr. BLATNIK. That is all I had.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much, Mr. Lepley.

Mr. LEPLEY. Thank you, sir.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Mulkern? We are very glad to have you, sir. Will you please give your full name and address and the capacity in which you appear for the benefit of the record?

## STATEMENT OF FRANK MULKERN, WASHINGTON, D. C., APPEARING ON BEHALF OF THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA

Mr. MULKERN. Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House Committee on Public Works, my name is Frank Mulkern. I reside at 3133 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and appear before this committee at the request of President William B. Holton, of the Izaak Walton League of America.

The league has nearly 100,000 members distributed through 570 chapters in most of the 48 States. Its concern in H. R. 1728 is that when this stupendous building program is undertaken proper advance planning be made by General Services in the location of suitable sites; that these buildings if erected be assured of an adequate water supply; that the required sewage disposal plants be of the most modern and most efficient design; and that the disposal of this treated sewage into streams of adequate flowage be so arranged as to not further contaminate the water supply of the District of Columbia.

In appearing some weeks ago before the Public Works Committee of the United States Senate, I urged that General Services take counsel with the officers of the Potomac River Commission. This Commission for 9 years has been collecting information on water and sewage problems of the Potomac River Valley.

Some days after the Senate hearings, I asked if General Services had made any contact with the Potomac River Commission. The answer was "No." A short time ago, General Services did make such a contact, and at a conference were told that several sites vaguely described as to location were impossible from the standpoint of water supply and sewage disposal. The cost of the efficient sewage-treatment plants such as now serves the Pentagon Building was $469,000 some years ago. Under influence of this inflation pressure, today it would be much higher. As to the total cost of this grand scheme, I might remind the committee: The original estimated price of the Pentagon was $35,000,000; the real and final cost, $85,000,000.

This bill, H. R. 1728, is the second or third of a series of similar bills. Each one has had a different cost estimate. All have to do with building a ring of great Government buildings around Washington. Each group of buildings would be the center of a small city of perhaps twenty to thirty thousand people. The whole plan would change the character of the entire area. It would bring great new problems in transportation, water supply, sewage disposal, and many

other items. This vast project requires most careful consideration by this committee and the Congress.

That is the end of my statement. But, gentlemen, may I say that the two witnesses who appeared before this committee just preceding my appearance have given me considerable and, I assume, have given you something to think about. As to Mr. Miller's problems in securing Government space in Washington, I am familiar with that, because I have had 15 years' experience in dealing with the leasing department of the Government. He is limited to 15 percent of the assessed valuation of property here in the payment of annual rent. He is also limited in the District of Columbia to 1 year's lease. Two buildings that I have had leased to the Government for a number of years were withdrawn from the Government about 2 or 3 years ago because the owners of these two buildings, which comprised a total of 93,000 square feet, were able to make long-term leases at a higher rate of rental than the Government could pay. So I think that these two gentlemen really have something.

As to this plan of spending $145,000,000, I was kind of shocked last night to read Secretary of the Treasury Snyder's statement. I have no doubt that this $145,000,000 will snowball up to perhaps $685,000,000, which Mr. Snyder expects to get from a 20-percent excise tax on automobiles.

Gentlemen, that is all I have to say.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Any questions?

Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. He has beer, whisky, and television sets in there also, you know.

Mr. MULKERN. I am just talking about the $685,000,000 which I think this project will cost this Government before it gets through with this H. R. 1728. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. DAVIS. You do not have any facts to base it on?

Mr. MULKERN. No; except the past. Not except the past history of Government expenditures; which you gentlemen know as well as I do.

Mr. DAVIS. You are particularly interested in keeping the streams pure and in trying to return the streams to those who come after us as we got them from our forebears. That is the whole Izaak Walton theory?

Mr. MULKERN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. And do you not think if they treated scientifically the sewage in disposal places and then turned it into streams with a sufficient flow of water, that would protect the fish life in those streams?

Mr. MULKERN. Well, I will tell you about the Pentagon. I have been in quite close contact with the Potomac River Commission and the sanitation people here.

The Pentagon disposal plant is one of the most perfect recently constructed. I am told that the water, the waste water, that comes into the Potomac River, is purer than the Potomac River itself at the point of its entrance. And that will have to be done, or else we will go backward.

As to your chlorine content, you probably know what it tastes like when you open the faucet. Twenty years ago we didn't have that. The Washington water was very highly regarded. Now it is getting

pretty nearly impossible to drink. As this increased chlorination process to purify the water as to its bacterial content goes on, it will taste worse and worse. It will, of course, affect fish life. I am not speaking particularly to that, thought I do like to fish.

Mr. DAVIS. The Izaak Walton League is particularly interested in fish and wildlife?

Mr. MULKERN. And forestation. We like to see our forests kept so that people can enjoy them. We would like to see the Yellowstone and other parks kept the same. In fact, we have frequently bought ground and added it to the national parks.

Mr. DAVIS. But from your own statement as regards the Pentagon Building, you feel that this sewage could be so scientifically treated that it would not disturb the waters of the Potomac?

Mr. MULKERN. The Pentagon does not disturb the waters of the Potomac at the present time.

Mr. DAVIS. And you could, of course, carry that right on into these proposed developments, and so treat that sewage, and you would have a similar situation as to that disposal?

Mr. MULKERN. Yes. What I wanted the Potomac River Commission to give General Services data on was that where they located these sites a stream of sufficient flowage would take this sewage which would be treated before it hit the stream. But if you didn't have any stream, you would have sewage piling out on the ground. We don't want the water supply here to go backward. We are trying to make it go forward and trying to clean it up. It has been a hard job, but we are making progress.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Pickett?

Mr. PICKETT. No questions.

Mr. TRIMBLE. We are very happy to have our chairman of the full committee, Mr. Buckley, with us.

Any questions, Mr. Buckley?

The CHAIRMAN. I have no questions, thank you.

Mr. TRIMBLE. That completes the list of witnesses that the chairman has.

Is there anyone here who would like to testify?

If not, the committee stands adjourned until 10 o'clock Thursday morning, at which time we will have an executive session to hear classified testimony from the Air Corps and the Atomic Energy Commission.

(Whereupon, at 2:55 p. m., the committee adjourned.)

# DISPERSAL OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1951**

House of Representatives,
Committee on Public Works,
Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds,
*Washington, D. C.*

The subcommittee met at 2 p. m., the Honorable James W. Trimble (chairman) presiding.

Mr. Trimble. The subcommittee will be in order. We will hear from Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner, Public Buildings Administration. There are some questions to be propounded by the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Davis.

Mr. Davis. I thought it would be of value, Mr. Chairman, to have in the record of the hearings the answers to about three or four questions that I suggested to Mr. Reynolds. As this matter is finally discussed on the floor, I think these answers will have a very direct bearing on the importance of this whole project.

No. 1, Mr. Reynolds, I think I asked you if you recalled the total amount of money expended in the construction of temporary buildings during World War II.

## STATEMENT OF W. E. REYNOLDS, COMMISSIONER, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Reynolds. The total amount expended on purely temporary buildings was $24,035,527.

Mr. Davis. Do you recall how many buildings that represented?

Mr. Reynolds. Twenty nine buildings.

Mr. Davis. Those buildings were put up under emergency conditions and speed was necessary. I think it was common knowledge at that time that it was not expected the life of those buildings would go beyond 5 years, is that correct?

Mr. Reynolds. That is correct.

Mr. Davis. At this time, many years over the 5-year computation, it is now found that the maintenance on those buildings is excessive, is it not?

Mr. Reynolds. It is very high.

Mr. Davis. It is your judgment, based on long experience both in and out of the Federal Government, it would not be wise to repeat that pattern again by the erection of additional temporary buildings similar in character to those erected during World War II?

Mr. Reynolds. I think it would be a tragic mistake.

Mr. Davis. Do you have any figures, Mr. Reynolds, to indicate the total number of Federal employees directly assignable to Washington and its immediate area during World War II?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Two hundred and sixty-seven thousand people, which does not include the military installations, such as the Navy installations, and mapping, or anything of that sort. It is the figure we use as a base figure for people that we have to provide housing for.

Mr. DAVIS. It is your duty, or you find the responsibility within your office, to find working space for Federal employees, not only in the District of Columbia, but throughout the country?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. DAVIS. Have the departments given you a sum total of what they may expect in the way of an increase in the Federal personnel population in, say, the next 12 to 18 months, as the mobilization goes along?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The figure on June 30, 1950, was 183,000. As of the middle of January, it was about 195,000. It will increase about 40,000 in the next 18 months.

Mr. DAVIS. Let me ask you one other question. Have you lost available space to private corporations since the so-called close of World War II? In other words, how much space did you have during that period that you do not have now available for use to take care of these added people as they come in?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The difference between the space we now rent and what was rented in World War II is slightly over 4,400,000 square feet.

Mr. DAVIS. In other words, you now have more than 3,000,000 square feet less available space for rental than you had during the period of World War II?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I beg your pardon. It is 4,400,000.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is that the District of Columbia, or all of the United States?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is the District of Columbia, and the areas around here.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I understand you have moved some agencies of Government in the District of Columbia since that time into other areas; is that right?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The movement took place prior to the peak rental in Washington; that is, the decentralization program. We moved out approximately 30,000 positions in 1941. These figures I am quoting here were at the peak, around 1943.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You are just giving us the District of Columbia area, and not the total rental space throughout the United States?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIS. Has it become necessary in the recent months for you to take over apartments or other buildings recently constructed for private use to supply space for needed Federal agencies?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We are taking over two apartment houses now, one at Twenty-second Street and Massachusetts Avenue, the other at Seventeenth Street and Massachusetts Avenue.

We are hopeful we can get by without any more, although we are negotiating with owners of two additional apartment houses today. They are not large, however.

Mr. DAVIS. Could you state, roughly, how many people could be accommodated in the two you are taking over?

Mr. REYNOLDS. About 2,000, I think would be a maximum.

Mr. DAVIS. Of course, that is just a drop in the bucket, so to speak, as it relates to your immediate and pressing needs?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I would say this, Mr. Davis: We take over apartment houses with a great deal of regret, because we feel they are needed for housing people.

Secondly, they do not serve very well as office space, on account of the manner in which they are cut up. Also, the floor loading is less than it is in a standard office building.

Our problems at the moment are most critical, because this influx of people has occurred before we have had an opportunity to finish the General Accounting Office, which, of course, will release space for quite a number of people.

We are advancing the time of the completion by giving the contractor additional money for overtime, and things of that sort. The General Accounting Office is cooperating fully with us by moving into one end of the building when the other end is not even enclosed.

Mr. DAVIS. Am I correct in assuming that all the present so-called temporary World War II buildings are fully occupied?

Mr. REYNOLDS. They are fully occupied. There are in those—that is, the temporary buildings of World War II, and one old temporary west of the new Interior Building which is a carry-over from World War I—about 30,000 people.

There are about 18,000 in the three buildings of concrete construction that were built in World War I; namely, the Munitions Building, the Navy Building, both on Constitution Avenue; and Temporary E Building, which is in the center of the Mall.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not want to prolong this line of questioning. But, for the moment, forgetting all considerations of so-called military security in connection with dispersal, is it not your judgment that the monumental type of Federal building is just about a thing of the past in the over-all planning of the Nation's Capital City?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think so, without question. When you speak of "monumental type," of course, you think of free-standing columns and architecture of that kind.

I believe it is correct to say there will be little if any of that done in the future. We have been getting away from it outselves the last several years.

The buildings to be built from now on, with the possible exception of the completion of the State Department building at Twenty-first and Virginia, which is only now the head house, should be in the peripheral areas, quite apart from distance, where they are very simple in design. It is the same situation as where a manufacturing company goes out to the edge of a city and builds an office building for itself. You are familiar with those. When you go from here to New York on the train, you can see them north of Philadelphia. That is the sort of structure we believe is proper for the environs of Washington.

Mr. DAVIS. It is a matter of common knowledge that the traffic congestion in the city of Washington poses a very serious problem in the early morning hours and late afternoon hours when men and women are going to and from their places of work. That is a matter of common knowledge; is it not?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. Is it not your judgment that a building located 20 miles from Washington, irrespective of the security consideration at all, a building of that character housing Federal employees, a func-

tional-type working building, having in mind the reduced cost as compared to the monumental type building, that such functional building 20 miles away from the heart of the city of Washington would be conducive to more efficient work on the part of the employees once they got into the building?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think, looking at it from a long-range view, that certainly is correct. The problems that the cities today pose are very, very difficult. It is on account of the fact they were laid out a long time ahead of the development of the automobile. The streets are usually narrow. They do not have proper throughways, and they are difficult to provide.

People normally lived in the center of the city, when it was only a hop, skip, and jump to the country. Now the central cores of our cities—and we are not speaking particularly of Washington, but a lot of them—are becoming decadent. Your tax structure is reduced.

The solution to it takes two directions, as I see it. One is the dispersal of the industry of our cities—in Washington, the Government is the industry here—to so-called satellite communities, which can be properly designed, knowing what we have ahead of us in the way of transportation, the needs of recreation, school facilities, control and location of businesses so you do not have them scattered on strings 5 miles or 10 miles long, as you find it in Los Angeles. That is one phase of the problem.

The second phase, which is much more important, is to take the areas that you now have there in the cities and put in controlled-access highways so that you can reestablish good living conditions in the central portions of a city.

You recognize that all the streets you have in this gridiron pattern of itself takes up about 21 percent of the area and still it does not provide for the travel. There are no playgrounds, for instance. The kids use the curbs for park benches. It takes a good deal of money for that sort of thing. It will take a long time to do it.

One express highway will carry the traffic of about 10 ordinary streets; 8 certainly. If there were some way you could remove this pattern—there is enough land now in the normal street pattern of our cities, if that could be reassembled, so you could put in proper highways and have enough left over for parks and all the amenities of good living.

Many of the cities are looking in that direction to see what can be done. But certainly when you move into the peripheral areas you then have an opportunity to review the mistakes of the past. As I say, around these centers there should be very careful control of land use, the lay-out of streets, highways, and things of that sort.

Mr. DAVIS. That second alternate would prove very expensive, and it would require a considerable amount of time?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; it is a long-range program. The city of St. Louis is attempting to do something of that sort now. They made the prophecy a few years ago that, while they have about 900,000 population within the city limits, unless something was done by 1980, their population would be reduced to 500,000. That is a public statement. So, they are doing something about it.

Mr. DAVIS. Bartholomew, one of the good planners of the country, worked on that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. He comes from St. Louis.

Mr. DAVIS. With respect to the time to go to and from work, located in an office 20 miles away, I will ask you a question which I think speaks for itself. But is it not fair to reason that, with good mass transportation on a modern highway, the average employee could leave a residence in Washington and, in most instances, go 20 miles in the same time, or comparable time, that he could ordinarily from that same point midst the heavy traffic of the downtown city, as in Washington, or any other city?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Surely.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all, Mr. Chairman. I wanted those questions to go into the formal record.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. McGregor?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I appreciate my good friend from Tennessee bringing out the amount of the square-footage space we have. But in order to keep the record straight, and so we will not be misled, I ask: Do you feel the space required for various bureaus is getting less?

I hope the Commissioner will also put in the number of square feet of space we have outside the District of Columbia, in addition to what we had at the start of World War II. In other words, I fear that the questioning of Mr. Davis, relative to the District of Columbia rental space for bureaus, will mislead people and cause them to feel our Federal pay roll is becoming smaller.

I think if you will include the square feet of space we are moving out into the far West—for instance, Chicago and Kansas City—for agencies we have moved out of the District of Columbia, we will have some idea of the growth and what we are being asked to do from time to time for the Federal agencies.

I believe it is growing and growing, and as long as we keep giving them the space I fear our Federal payrolls will continue to increase.

I would like to make one observation on the temporary buildings. I noted a number of times this morning it was said they were constructed for an emergency, not to last longer than five years. I was a member of that committee, if you recall. At no time during the hearing did I ever hear the 5-year period mentioned. We constructed them as temporary, but we did not expect them to fall down in 5 years. They have lasted longer than we expected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think I have put this in the testimony before. But, at the time we started on the construction of these buildings, President Roosevelt called me over to this office and asked me to design them so they would fall down in 5 years, because he was continually embarrassed by the fact that he was responsible for the Munitions and Navy Buildings being down on Constitution Avenue.

At that time I told the President: "If they will stand up for 5 years, they are going to stand up longer if we maintain them." And everyone knows we would do that.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do not know what your conversation was with the President, but if you had come to the committee for an expenditure for a building that would last only 5 years, and then it would fall down, I doubt if you would have gotten the money.

I have a high regard for you and your organization, Mr. Commissioner, but the charge was made by some of the Maryland people that your department has not cooperated at all with the various agencies in Maryland relative to planning. I wonder if you have any comment on that charge?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We have had little opportunity to work with the people in Maryland, because we have done nothing in Maryland for about 12 years, except one structure. I am speaking of the purchase of the land for the National Institute of Health.

When we purchased that land, we worked with them on the location of that cross-country highway. But the land was immediately adjacent to the present property, and we were forced to buy land in that direction. Then it was a question of sitting down with the Commission and working out the location of the highway.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I believe you were in the room when it was charged they did not have the opportunity to sit down with you when that location was determined; is that right?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; we discussed it with them at length, as to the location.

As I heard the testimony the other day, they were not too happy with the compromise that was worked out. Although that was the first I had ever heard there was any question about there being a joint agreement.

Mr. MCGREGOR. As I understood his testimony, it was the fact that the location selected forced them to change their road alinement in one particular instance, which changed the road system in Maryland, and they were not very well pleased about it.

It is a policy of your department—is it not?—to meet and invite discussion, not necessarily to have to obey the dictates of the various groups, but you do invite them for discussion in order that you may arrive at the determining factor where these locations are to be?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We expect to work with them. We work with planning commissions all over America, and have for years, when we have a major problem in a city.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I know that is the condition in our State. I would like to ask one more question, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if you have been in conference with the Bureau of the Budget, who told us sometime ago that possibly there would be agencies moving from the District representing 25,000 employees? Have they consulted with you relative to the location of these various agencies in other sections of the country?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes; they have. They have not given us the agency they were talking about, but they have given us the general geographical area and asked us to see, within a group of cities, whether we could find, say, X number of square feet to house them.

We have people now working in most every State of the Union on that very problem, to match up the agency that could be moved with the space that can be found to be available, or the housing where you would move one of these agencies would be reasonably available.

They have strenuously worked on this program; we have worked very hard on it ourselves. It is not a simple thing. You have not only to find space and housing that will fit one of these agencies, but also you must put them in a geographical area where they can operate on a permanent basis.

Our problem here is much more aggravated than it was at the beginning of the last war, because then location was not a major factor. They were decentralized on the basis that they would return. Now the requirement is that when they are moved out they stay out.

Mr. McGregor. I am in complete accord with that, Commissioner. It seems to me, from the past record, if they are willing to move out, on their own figures, 25,000, maybe some of us could help them and we could get out 40,000 or 50,000, permanently, of the various agencies in the District of Columbia.

I do not know what the agencies are. But I hope the chairman of this subcommittee will find out what they are, so we can discuss them. It seems to me that certain agencies, such as Agriculture, Social Security, Railroad Retirement, and a lot of others, do not need to be in Washington. They can be out in the Midwest or far West and operate just as conveniently, if not more efficiently, than they can here.

I hope later on, Mr. Chairman, we will know the agencies that are contemplated being moved, and we can sit down with Mr. Reynolds and go over them as a committee.

Mr. Reynolds. Only as late as yesterday, and at noon again, I was talking with the people in the Bureau of the Budget, urging them to send up a supplemental appropriation which would permit us to start decentralization. This bill which is before you bears on the question of decentralization in section 2. The intent of section 2 is to permit decentralization of activities where by law the head of it, or the function, is to be at the seat of government.

We want that restriction removed so we can move out additional agencies. There are agencies, and parts thereof, that do not come under that prohibition, which could be moved under present authority. That is the group that I want to get money for as quickly as I can so I can get them out of here. It is purely selfish, because I have to find some additional space quickly.

Mr. McGregor. I am in accord with the word "decentralization," rather than "additional." When we move an agency out of Washington, I want it moved out and not just moved out and another branch of that agency come back into Washington.

Mr. Reynolds. That is right.

Mr. Pickett. In connection with the interrogation by Mr. Davis a few moments ago, you stated in World War II, you constructed 29 buildings for a cost of $24,000,000. These buildings, as I understand it, were all temporary buildings of the wood-frame type?

Mr. Reynolds. That is right.

Mr. Pickett. It does not include the Munitions Building, the Navy building, and Temporary E, which were constructed in World War I, is that right?

Mr. Reynolds. That is right.

Mr. Pickett. What would it cost to construct a comparable number of buildings, of comparable size and capacity, of like type construction?

Mr. Reynolds. I would say it would cost probably double.

Mr. Pickett. Mr. Reynolds, how many people were in those 29 temporary buildings in World War II, when the number of employees in the District was at its peak?

Mr. Reynolds. About the same number we have now. We have them pretty well jammed up.

Mr. Pickett. What is that number?

Mr. Reynolds. About 30,000, that is, in temporary buildings of World War II.

Mr. PICKETT. You gave Mr. Davis certain figures relative to the number of employees in the District as of June 30, 1950, and at the present time, and then made your estimate of what it would be in 18 months. You also gave him the figures in reference to the total number of World War II, which was 267,000, at its peak.

At a comparable period to World War II, when preparations were in progress, as we are now making them, to accommodate a peak load of personnel in the District, what was the figure? By that I mean, the figure that was comparable to that on last June 30.

Mr. REYNOLDS. You are going back in my memory a bit. It was about 195,000.

Mr. PICKETT. Then you had an increment of around 72,000 persons from the comparable period prior to World War II to the peak, is that right?

Mr. REYNOLDS. About 90,000, I would say.

Mr. PICKETT. You expect not quite such a large increase, at the present time, in the next 18 months over what existed as of June 30, 1950?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; we expect an increase of about 40,000 in the next 18 months.

Mr. PICKETT. I believe that is all. Thank you, sir.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Scudder.

Mr. SCUDDER. I was a little late in coming in. The question was asked this morning before we left that we be given the estimate of the cost of the units to be located outside the city of Washington. Has the information been given as to what the program of decentralization would cost, and as to the number of buildings required?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The authorized amount in the bill is $145,000,000, which includes $5,400,000 for locations, and $32,500,000 for roads. The remainder is for the purchase of sites, the building of buildings, the providing of water, sewage disposal, and things of that sort.

There has been no estimate prepared for this committee on the cost of the decentralization program as opposed to dispersal. That is a question that does not need authorization, because basic authorization exists except for the technicality that arises in connection with agencies about the seat of government.

Mr. SCUDDER. How many square feet of space would be made available at each one of these dispersal units?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We are figuring on the fact for 5,000 persons at each one, if the program provides for permanent buildings to house 30,000 people.

Mr. SCUDDER. How many square feet would that be?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We figure about 90 square feet per person for office space. That increases to about 130 to 135 for files and records, and things of that sort. In addition to that, you have to have space for cafeterias and shops. So these buildings, I think, would run, including the basements, about 800,000 gross square feet. That is out-to-out of wall, including stairways and everything else.

Mr. SCUDDER. About what will be the cost of one building and the site?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think we figure each one of them, that is, the cost of the site, the utilities, the building, and furnishings, at $17,850,000 each.

Mr. SCUDDER. What I am getting at, Mr. Commissioner, is that I was very much impressed by the statement made by a gentleman yesterday, or maybe the day before, to the effect that they can construct 600,000 square feet of office space, an underground program, out on Connecticut Avenue. After listening to the gentleman from the Atomic Energy Commission, and seeing his chart, it seems to me that such a program would assist in decentralizing a large number of employees. I think this proposal should be examined a little further. I have not heard anything that would lead me to believe that it was not a practical matter.

There would be a great difference in cost to the Government if a unit such as this were constructed by private enterprise. Perhaps we could place five of these units in the outlying areas and utilize one within the city, which would provide a bomb shelter, with the possibility of a superstructure over it, which might house a great number of people, and make available two or three times the amount of square footage that would be leased to the Government; this would substitute requiring the Government using the taxpayers' money and building more and more buildings that may not be necessary for future use.

The proposal strikes me as feasible. I am one who believes in free enterprise. I do not go along with the statements that the temporary buildings were a waste. I believe they have amortized themselves without a doubt, because of the difference in cost of the temporary building and a thoroughly well-constructed class A building; and take into consideration what we are paying in interest in the United States, almost 3 percent, and figure the saving of that 3 percent to the taxpayers, those buildings without a doubt have more than paid for themselves now, and the Government is out nothing. The building of the temporary structures I believe was a very wise move at the time it was done.

I would like to see the program as a whole developed, a survey made, and a full report brought into this committee. As far as I am concerned, it may be entirely impractical, and it may be that private industry could put up these buildings without any capital outlay by the Federal Government, in which event we would be able to reduce the request in the appropriation.

I believe in a program of building these units outside the city of Washington. You have temporary buildings. You might have to make them permanent or semipermanent. But if private industry could rent floor space to the Government, at a reasonable figure, I believe we should look to them for some of the floor space we need in this emergency.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I would like to talk to your question a moment. I appreciate your comments in connection with the temporary buildings, because I have felt rather guilty over the years because I was the one responsible for building them the way they were built. We built them rather inexpensively, as you know.

The proposal that was made to you here yesterday is for a building at Connecticut Avenue and Albemarle Street, where there is a natural gully. They propose to put in four floors there underground. You will note in the testimony that the proponent of that plan wanted to amend this bill so that we would be authorized to enter into a lease for 10 years, which, of course, would be a firm lease.

I question, in my own mind, whether it is proper to enter into a 10-year lease for a structure where the people are working in basements without any outside light. I could understand they might want to work there awhile, or could work there a while, I know that in industry they build big factories without windows, at times, and they are air-conditioned, which this would have to be, but those people are moving around, they are working at machines; it is open space, and they are not sitting at a desk.

The experience with office-type buildings with no windows has not been too good in certain areas, on account of claustrophobia.

One reasons I am opposed to 10-year leases is this: We expect to propose to this committee very shortly legislation which will permit us to enter into contracts for buildings constructed by private industry on a lease-purchase arrangement, whereby, by paying the same amount of rent we would have to pay out at this location, we would own the building in about 17 years.

To me, that is a much sounder approach than to amend this legislation to permit us to rent buildings for 10 years, authority I do not think we should have.

Mr. McGregor. Will the gentleman yield? Why could we not amend this bill to incorporate that provision?

Mr. Reynolds. It is a rather lengthy piece of legislation, Mr. McGregor. I am speaking of those features which will permit us to obtain money from insurance companies at a minimum rate, and protect both the private owner and the Government. It cannot be done in a simple section. We have been working on this legislation now for about 2½ months.

The reason it has not been before this committee before is that the Post Office Department is involved in this picture, because a lot of our demand throughout the United States is for the Post Office Department, primarily parcel post stations in large cities.

The Post Office Department now has our proposed legislation. They are working it over to see how the two can be tied together, because we do not, in our jurisdiction, want the authority to build a substation for the Post Office Department, say, in Cleveland, Ohio, because they are going to use that substation, they are going to use it in its entirety and they are responsible for getting the rent for it.

They think this legislation will save the Government a tremendous amount of money, from the post-office angle alone. They now have the authority to enter into 20-year leases, but they have no authority whatever to enter into a lease-purchase arrangement. At the end of the 20 years, their experience has been that they usually pay more from that time on than they did in the first 20 years, and they should have owned the building at that time.

Mr. Davis. The man who puts up the building owns it, instead of the Government?

Mr. Reynolds. Yes, and you pay substantially the same amount.

I think I mentioned before that the State of California passed a law 2 years ago. They confined it, in their case, to lands owned by the State of California. The legislation we propose does not confine it to that. It permits the use of Government-owned land or privately owned land.

Mr. Scudder. You naturally are closer to the picture than I would be. I believe any program of that nature should be explored. One

of the things you might be able to do under the lease contract would be to help the tax situation a bit. As far as the city of Washington is concerned, they either have to collect their money for running their government from taxes or secure a general appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States, which is paid for by all the people of the country for the maintenance of the Government here in Washington.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is true.

Mr. SCUDDER. I believe the overbalance of Federal buildings here necessitates large Federal aid. It does not matter whether some private owner pays taxes or you collect the taxes from the general public throughout the country and subvert it into the city of Washington to operate the Government. A dollar is a dollar, from whatever source it comes. If we had more private-enterprise construction in Washington, we would have more taxes for local government.

Mr. REYNOLDS. This law would be applicable to this program, except for two things. It would be very difficult to get the private entrepreneur to go out into these areas, where you have to work with municipalities, and work out a joint sewage disposal system, water supply system, and all that sort of thing. They would not be in a position to put in the road networks. It is really an emergency situation as well.

I do have this feeling. I base this upon a good many years' experience here in Government. I think I have spent about 20 years of my life testifying before this committee. I think it is pretty hard to get money out of Congress to build buildings even though they are desperately needed.

If we can get the other law through, I think most of the buildings will be built by private enterprise. We will get the buildings in that way, instead of paying rent and then after a long period of time not getting anything out of it.

Mr. SCUDDER. I am not in disagreement with the dispersal program, but am interested in the locations and cost of same.

Mr. REYNOLDS. These laws I am speaking of will apply to the District of Columbia, as well as outside.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Are there any further questions, Mr. Scudder?

Mr. SCUDDER. No.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We are generally in agreement, Mr. Commissioner, but I cannot see why the actual construction of these buildings cannot be done by private capital by amending this law. The matters relating to sewage, and other things, would be taken by the Federal Government in accordance with the political subdivision involved, but in my opinion the actual construction of these buildings could be done by private capital and we could have an owner-lease arrangement. You take the position that it could not be done and it would delay the project?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I would say, as far as the building itself is concerned, if you had the site, water, and sewerage, there is no question but what an amendment to this legislation permitting a lease-purchase arrangement would get the buildings built. I do not think there is any question about that. We would have to give them priority assistance, which might be difficult.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Bray.

Mr. BRAY. I have no questions.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you, Mr. Reynolds, for your statement. I wonder if it would be possible to have placed in the record, at the conclusion of your testimony, the number of agencies under section 2 that have been decided upon for decentralization?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall attempt to get that information for you.

(The information is as follows:)

The statutes creating the major executive departments provide their establishment "at the seat of Government." Subsequently, various bureaus were established by statute "in" or "within" a specific department. While these subsequent statutes did not specify that the bureau in question be located "at the seat of Government," it is assumed that the intent of the statute was to so provide.

The legislation proposed in section 2 of the bill is required to permit dispersal or decentralization when deemed desirable. Parts of seven departments are now being recommended for such action. This number may be increased after the cessation of the present emergency when consideration will be given to locating permanent activities at dispersal locations in space no longer required by emergency functions.

The present plans propose the decentralization of some 25,000 positions from the District of Columbia and adjacent areas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much. Without objection, let the record show at this point that Mr. J. Ross McKeever, of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, appeared before the committee and submitted a supplemental statement by Mr. John Nolen, Jr., Director of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 7, 1951.*

Subject: H. R. 1728—Dispersal program.

Hon. JAMES W. TRIMBLE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds,*
*Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. TRIMBLE: Following my testimony at the hearing on H. R. 1728 yesterday, I advised you that the northern Virginia planning agencies were making a survey of the problem of financing and comprehensive planning work which would be required under the dispersal program. In accordance with your invitation, a summary of this survey will be presented before your subcommittee on February 8, by Virginia representatives.

This survey, which was made at our suggestion, points up the following facts or issues bearing on the Commission's proposed amendment:

1. Comprehensive plans for guiding or controlling community development in the territory most affected by the dispersal projects are not available.

2. This fact will not delay speedy decision on the location of dispersal projects, which quite evidently will be made independently.

3. The necessity for coordinate planning of Federal and local developments during and following construction of the dispersal projects is obvious if the purpose of dispersal is to be retained over the years.

4. This comprehensive planning cannot be done in time to be of value without the immediate financial aid provided in the amendment.

My firm impression is that the northern Virginia local governments which will be affected by the dispersal projects desperately need the assistance of regional and local planning to meet the impact of this program after General Services Administration places the problem in their laps, and that they are anxious to work closely with our Commission in coordinating their plans with Federal activities, were they to be given the funds with which to do this constructive work.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN NOLEN, Jr., *Director of Planning.*

Mr. TRIMBLE. Let there also be inserted in the record a letter addressed to the Honorable Charles A. Buckley, dated February 6, 1951, from the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington 25, D. C., February 6, 1951.*

Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works,*
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: By letter dated January 22, 1951, you requested the views of the Department of Defense with respect to H. R. 1728, a bill to authorize a program to provide for the construction of Federal buildings outside of, but in the vicinity of and accessible to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1728 would authorize the Administrator of General Services to provide facilities in the vicinity of the District of Columbia for the accommodation of the activities of the Federal Government. He would be authorized to assign and reassign space in the buildings to executive agencies. The bill would also authorize the appropriation to the Administrator of General Services of $190,000,000 to carry out the provisions thereof.

The Department of Defense supports the enactment of H. R. 1728 because the dispersal of the executive agencies of the Government from the city of Washington is essential in order to carry out the policy and intent of the bill to provide for the continuance at all times of the conduct of the vital business of the Nation. Maj. Gen. William R. Schmidt, Chairman of the Decentralization Board, testified on behalf of the Department of Defense before the Public Buildings Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of the Senate in support of S. 218, the companion bill to H. R. 1728. When he appeared before the Senate committee, Major General Schmidt testified to the following effect:

"The Department of Defense is in agreement with the dispersal plan for the security of the Nation's Capital. The Department of Defense urges the passage of the bill before your committee for consideration today.

"It is essential for the security of the Nation's Capital that elements of the Department of Defense and other Government agencies, essential to the defense program and to the successful prosecution of the Government's business, be dispersed from the downtown area. This is a basic concept held by the military for a long period of time.

"The Department of Defense has no plans for dispersal of departmental activities other than the plan covered by this bill. It is possible that the planned creation of a supplemental communication installation at a nearby military post may have been interpreted to mean that the Defense Establishment has provided for its own dispersal. This interpretation is not correct.

"The Department of Defense has worked with the General Services Administration in developing this program of dispersal. This Department has also been studying its organization for some time to determine that functions can be performed or should be performed in the dispersal area or completely removed from the Washington area. The result of this study is now being prepared for submission to the Bureau of the Budget for its consideration. To disperse congested military functions will insure continuity of operation and should be expedited."

The dispersal contemplated by H. R. 1728 would tend to insure a necessary continuity of operation in the conduct of the executive branch of the Government. The need for such dispersal will become more acute as the defense agencies add to the present congestion in downtown Washington by the employment of additional personnel in connection with the current preparedness program. The danger of a disruption of operation as well as the severity of such a disruption becomes greater with that added congestion. It will become even more acute as we continue to mobilize our forces under the current preparedness program.

The Department of Defense has worked with the General Services Administration in developing the program of dispersal that would be provided by this bill. This Department has also for some time been studying its organization to determine what functions can be performed or should be performed in the dispersal areas or completely removed from the Washington area. We will continue to cooperate with the General Services Administration in connection with this important matter.

This report is submitted to you without the prior clearance by the Bureau of the Budget because time did not permit such a clearance.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

Mr. TRIMBLE. We are happy to have with us our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Howard Smith. We would like to hear you at this time.

## STATEMENT OF HON. HOWARD W. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SMITH. We have here this afternoon representatives of Arlington and Fairfax Counties, who would like to make a brief statement.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Do you prefer to have them come before you?

Mr. SMITH. That will be agreeable. Mr. Kinnier is the planning manager for Arlington County.

Mr. DAVIS. I suggest you invite the judge to come up here.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Yes, sit with us Judge Smith.

You may state your name to the reporter and give us your statement.

## STATEMENT OF C. L. KINNIER, PLANNING ENGINEER, ARLINGTON COUNTY BOARD, ARLINGTON, VA.

Mr. KINNIER. My name is C. L. Kinnier, planning engineer for Arlington County, Va., representing the County Board of Arlington County.

Mr. Chairman, the county manager has sent to Mr. Trimble, the chairman of this subcommittee, certain statements which were presented to the Senate Committee on Public Works. I want to be sure these statements are included in the record.

Mr. TRIMBLE. The statements have been inserted in the record.

Mr. KINNIER. Very well, sir. In addition to that, Arlington County, of course, being only about 24 miles in area, and all of it being within less than 6 miles of the zero milepost, does not feel that it is going to have any of these buildings within its area. However, we are going to be considerably affected from a highway standpoint and from an access-road standpoint to the buildings, wherever they be located outside of Arlington County.

We are very much interested in the planning angle of placing these buildings. We do not want these highways to be improved and to be made limited-access highways, in such a manner that the county is going to be left isolated along side of the road, and no one can get off or on from Arlington County.

We are interested in the amending of this bill, if possible, in such a manner that the Capital Park and Planning Commission, and the local authorities, can have some planning money under the bill in order to work with the bureau of public works and the State highway department to the end that the county be not adversely affected.

I think that is about our position, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Were you here yesterday when the people from the Maryland side testified?

Mr. KINNIER. I was not here.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Do you have any questions, Mr. Davis? Mr. McGregor? Mr. Scudder?

Mr. SCUDDER. I understand that your objection is that you do not want them to create a freeway through your county?

Mr. KINNIER. No; I do not want a freeway unless there is adequate access through, in, and out of the county, into the freeway.

Mr. SCUDDER. What would you determine to be an adequate access?

Mr. KINNIER. Frequent interchanges of traffic so that we could get on and off the freeway. I anticipate that the Shirley Highway or Lee Boulevard or Lee Highway, or some of the existing major thoroughfares, will be made limited access to the extent that the traffic can get from Washington out there, and from there to Washington without having to stop frequently.

There could be certain inclusions of interchanges that would not hurt the highway and would not hurt the county. We want to get in on that and want planning points to be provided to enable us to do the work.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Bray? Mr. Pickett?

Mr. PICKETT. I take it from what you say that the accessibility for the local residents of Shirley Highway and Lee Boulevard is satisfactory to you folks that have to deal with it every day?

Mr. KINNIER. It is at this time.

Mr. PICKETT. You would not want it any more restricted than that?

Mr. KINNIER. That is correct.

Mr. PICKETT. There is a new highway that takes off at Key Bridge and runs up the county side of Potomac River, is there not?

Mr. KINNIER. George Washington Parkway.

Mr. PICKETT. Is that satisfactorily constructed from the standpoint of access to you folks out there, to meet the situation?

Mr. KINNIER. It is not at this time. There is no way to get off Key Bridge and go up the river. That is a matter that we are discussing with the Bureau of Public Roads at this time.

Mr. PICKETT. I mean, after you get on the freeway, excusing the Key Bridge trouble, it is all right?

Mr. KINNIER. Yes.

Mr. PICKETT. If you get the Key Bridge corner knocked out you will be satisfied with it?

Mr. KINNIER. Yes.

Mr. PICKETT. Do you folks feel that you need any substantial amount of money in Arlington County to help promulgate your views in reference to the planning of these access roads and highways?

Mr. KINNIER. The Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission is to make a statement here this afternoon. That includes a statement as to our request, which we made to them night before last, of $15,000.

Mr. PICKETT. In other words, the northern Virginia group will speak for you folks from the standpoint of money?

Mr. KINNIER. That is right.

Mr. PICKETT. Thank you, sir.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Smith, who is our next witness?

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Corbalis, the sanitary engineer of Fairfax County, is next.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Will you give your name to the reporter?

## STATEMENT OF JAMES J. CORBALIS, JR., SANITARY ENGINEER, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA.

Mr. CORBALIS. My name is James J. Corbalis, Jr., sanitary engineer, County of Fairfax, Va.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I would like to speak to you today at the request of Mr. John W. Brookfield, who is the chairman of the Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission. That commission has a statement prepared for you. I would like to present it at this time.

Mr. PICKETT. May I interrupt you just a moment? What is the extent and the territory of your jurisdiction?

Mr. CORBALIS. The membership of the Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission comprises the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Prince William, and Loudoun, and the town of Manassas.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It takes in highway alinements, too?

Mr. CORBALIS. Yes, sir.

The Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission whose membership includes the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Prince William, and Loudoun, the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, and the town of Manassas is concerned with the proper planning and economic development of the northern Virginia communities.

We are appreciative of the opportunity which you have extended us today to present our views on a subject of such vital concern to us. The commission has considered the proposed dispersal program of the Federal Government with respect to the impact upon its constituent communities which is likely to result from the adoption of this program, and after consultation with the interested officials of these communities offers you the benefit of its opinion in the matter.

We recognize that the adoption of a program which would provide dispersal units at locations outside of a 20-mile limit from Washington, D. C., which presumably could mean the selection of one or more such sites in northern Virginia, might well adversely affect the welfare of community life in northern Virginia if the sites were chosen without proper regard to the nature and extent of the problems which will be associated therewith or created thereby. It is generally agreed, however, that with an assurance on the part of the Federal Government, in cooperation with local governmental agencies, that concurrent planning for the prevention of the creation or the solution of these problems and the immediate or subsequent financial assistance to provide any necessary community facilities will be provided, the establishment of such dispersal units in certain parts of northern Virginia would not adversely affect the welfare of the citizens of the areas.

The problems of the development of adequate water supply and sewage disposal systems, highway and thoroughfare plans, population distribution, land use, park and recreational facilities, schools and other community facilities, all will require a considerable amount of advance or concurrent planning if adverse effects are to be eliminated or minimized.

Our commission has consulted its constituent members to determine the nature and extent of these planning problems and has learned

that all of these members are aware of the impelling necessity to gird themselves for the planning efforts which will be required, yet none of them are presently financially able to convert their desires or responsibilities into effective action.

Assuming that a part of the funds required for this purpose could be made available by local governmental agencies, the peculiarities of including appropriations in budgets and securing the required revenue from taxation would prevent any funds from becoming available before January 1, 1952.

This could well result in a situation of being too late with too little. In cooperation with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission we have circulated a questionnaire relating to the planning problems that will be associated with the proposed dispersal program and we attach hereto for your consideration a copy of the questionnaire and copies of the replies that were received from the various constituent members of our commission.

Without knowing the actual location of the sites that may be chosen in northern Virginia for the establishment of dispersal units it is, of course, impossible to develop any detailed estimates of the cost of preparing the necessary planning studies, but being aware of the effect that may result upon already established communities in northern Virginia from this program the constituent members have estimated the cost of undertaking the planning studies in each of the jurisdictions.

A summation of these figures reveals that a sum of $350,000 is expected to be needed to commence the preparation of the necessary planning studies to assure the timely and proper solution of the problems that will certainly be created or accentuated in each of the various communities.

Mr. DAVIS. How much money?

Mr. CORBALIS. $350,000.

Mr. DAVIS. For planning?

Mr. CORBALIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Your part of it?

Mr. CORBALIS. Yes, sir.

Our commission has reviewed the suggestion of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to secure an amendment to the legislation as presently proposed, which we understand was presented to you at a recent hearing on this subject, and we find that this amendment is specifically designed to provide assurance that the planning aspects of the dispersal program, as they relate to local communities, will not be overlooked in the maze of other associated problems. The commission endorses the amendment as proposed for the following reasons:

1. It is vital to the interest of the communities which may be affected by the dispersal program that care be exercised in the location of these dispersal units and that adequate planning for the accompanying residential and business development be provided in order that the communities may not find themselves saddled with incongruous and undesirable development entirely out of keeping with the general plan which each community is now attempting to follow.

2. In the northern Virginia area, especially in Fairfax and Prince William Counties, a serious problem in regard to providing adequate water supply and sewage disposal facilities now exists and this problem

should receive an immediate and thorough study in order that needless expense on the part of either the local communities or the Federal Government may be avoided.

3. Most of the northern Virginia communities are still suffering from the effects of the rapid expansion brought about by World War II and the subsequent activities of the Federal Government in Washington, D. C., and they do not have available funds or personnel for the planning which will be necessary to properly cope with the problems to be associated with the disposal program. For this reason the provisions of the amendment dealing with allocations of funds to the local communities is of paramount importance.

4. Any attempt to include such an amendment in later legislation would defeat the purpose of the provision which is to insure the planning will take place coincident with the actual decisions, rather than to have the decisions made first and the local jurisdictions be forced to alter their established plans to encompass an accomplished fact.

We believe that we would be remiss in the discharge of our responsibilities if we did not emphatically stress the importance of considering the local planning aspects of this dispersal program and urge the inclusion of the appropriate language in the pending legislation to assure proper regard thereto. We respectfully trust that you gentlemen will concur in our belief that the interest of both the Federal Government and the various local governments under the avowed purpose of the legislation will be better served if the amendment suggested by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission is incorporated in the legislation as enacted.

It is signed, "Respectfully yours, John W. Brookfield, chairman."

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much for that fine statement. You may furnish to the reporter any statement that you want introduced.

Mr. CORBALIS. I might add, in answer to the question on the total cost of money, the detailed estimate is included in the attached documents, should they be needed.

(The documents referred to are as follows:)

FAIRFAX COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD,
*Fairfax, Va., February 8, 1951.*

Mr. JOHN W. BROOKFIELD,
*Chairman, Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission, Fairfax, Va.*

Dear Mr. BROOKFIELD: You requested yesterday that I give you a statement regarding the public-school situation in Fairfax County and if there would be an increased problem with reference to providing school facilities for children, should the proposed plan for the dispersal of Government agencies result in the placing of some of those agencies in Fairfax County. I shall tell you briefly of the existing conditions of school housing in Fairfax County and the problems we would face, should there be a greater increase in school enrollment.

For the session 1930–31 there were 5,095 children enrolled in the schools of Fairfax County. For the 10-year period to 1940–41 there was an increase of 3,100 pupils, or an average of 310 per year. For the 5-year period to 1945–46 there was an increase of 2,436 children, or an average of 487 per year. For the last 4 years the increases have been as follows: session 1947–48—increase of 922 pupils; 1948–49—1,538 pupils; 1949–50—2,510 pupils; to December 1 of the session 1950–51—3,139 pupils. The enrollment in our schools on December 1, 1950, was 16,212.

The Fairfax County School Board has not been able to provide proper classroom facilities for the increased enrollment. Of the 16,212 children enrolled on December 1, 1950, only 7,984 were attending classes in standard classrooms,

while 8,228 were attending classes in nonstandard classrooms and attending school on the basis of double shifts. There were attending on the basis of double shifts 1,276 children; 2,325 were housed in temporary quarters—in churches, tourist camps, Quonset huts, and private homes; and 2,469 were in temporary rooms in school auditoriums, hallways, etc.

In December 1949, the Fairfax County School Board had a rather careful estimate made of its building needs to September 1951. The estimate of the amount of money needed on the basis of the then current building costs was $12,000,000. It is safe to estimate that on the basis of existing building costs and increases in school enrollments to date beyond those estimated by the school board it would take $15,000,000 at least to provide the school facilities needed. The school board does not have the funds to meet the needs as estimated in December 1949. The schools of Fairfax County have been seriously affected as a result of the rapid increase in enrollment and overcrowding, all of which has been brought about by the increased activities of the Federal Government in the Washington area. Should departments of the Federal Government be moved into Fairfax County or into other areas adjacent to Fairfax County, which might affect enrollment in the county schools, the situation would become much more aggravated. I am convinced that to meet such a situation it would be necessary for the Federal Government to provide funds for school buildings and probably in addition give some assistance toward maintenance and operation. It would be difficult at this time to estimate the amount of such need, since this would be dependent upon how many additional children would enter our schools.

I trust that this may be the information which you wish. I regret it appears I shall not be able to be with you when you appear before the Senate committee today.

Very truly yours,

W. T. WOODSON,
*Division Superintendent.*

---

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

*Survey of regional and local planning needs in the Washington region, under the proposed program for dispersal of Federal buildings, northern Virginia area, January 31, 1951*

I. STATUS OF EXISTING PLANS FOR EACH PLANNING JURISDICTION

(*a*) *Land use*

Are existing land use maps available and has a zoning plan been adopted?

(*b*) *Highways and thoroughfares*

Is there a general plan for the location of future highways and thoroughfares especially of the expressway and parking type which would be of value in the location of new Federal projects?

(*c*) *Subdivision control*

Are subdivision regulations in force and adequate to control extensive local development which may result from the dispersal program? Is there an approved highway plan with which subdivision plats must conform?

(*d*) *Public reservations*

Is there a map of existing public lands in the area and a plan showing the general locations for estimated future land requirements for parks, parkways, recreation areas, schools and public institutions?

(*e*) *Public utilities or services*

Are plans or reports available covering such problems as future water supply, sewage collection and disposal, such as would be required for any extensive local development stimulated by the dispersal program?

II. PRINCIPAL PLANNING PROBLEMS OR NEEDS TO BE CREATED BY THE DISPERSAL PROGRAM

(*a*) *Review of existing plans*

In general, are base maps and planning data sufficiently up to date and complete to be useful in revising existing plans for thoroughfares, population distribution, public and private land use, community facilities and services?

(*b*) *Adequacy of planning controls*

Are existing subdivision and zoning controls sufficiently adequate to regulate new developments which will be immediately stimulated when dispersal decisions are made? Are they adequate to bring about sound community growth and prevent haphazard roadside development?

(*c*) *Community facilities and services*

Will it probably be necessary to make entirely new studies or plans for community facilities, such as schools, water supply, sewage collection and disposal, etc.?

III. COLLABORATION ON PLANNING PROBLEMS IN THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA AREA

(*a*) Do the above questions generally cover the fields of planning in which there should be collaboration between the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission and its constituent agencies for the extension of revision of regional plans or are there other subjects which should be included? If so, what are they?

(*b*) Roughly, what additional costs will be required to meet the above problems and can local financial resources be made immediately available to meet the impact of the initial planning program?

---

City of Falls Church,
Office of Planning Engineer,
*Falls Church, Va., February 7, 1951.*

A Reply to a Questionnaire From the National Capital Park and Planning Commission With Regard to Local Planning Needs Under the Proposed Program for Dispersal of Federal Buildings

I. STATUS OF EXISTING PLANS FOR EACH PLANNING JURISDICTION

(*a*) *Land use*

There is an existing land use map made in April 1950 but copies are not available at this time. There are available copies of the zoning plan and zoning ordinance.

(*b*) *Highways and thoroughfares*

Such a plan is being prepared.

(*c*) *Subdivision control*

There is an adequate subdivision ordinance. The approved highway plan is being revised.

(*d*) *Public reservations*

Yes.

(*e*) *Public utilities or services*

Yes, as far as strictly local development is concerned. However, as Falls Church has the only publicly owned water system in the immediate vicinity, it is possible that it would have to be expanded to handle any large development within a radius of several miles to the west or north. The system is capable of such expansion and this would require a minimum of planning.

II. PRINCIPAL PLANNING PROBLEMS OR NEEDS TO BE CREATED BY THE DISPERSAL PROGRAM

(*a*) *Review of existing plans*

No.

(*b*) *Adequacy of Planning Controls*

Yes.

III. COLLABORATION ON PLANNING PROBLEMS IN THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA AREA

(*a*) Yes.
(*b*) No local financial resources available for planning.
Additional costs required are—

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. The completion of a master plan by a consultant | $20,000 |
| 2. Preparation of plans for a State-Federal expressway for Routes 211 and 7 through Falls Church to the west | 10,000 |
| 3. For the water system | 5,000 |
| Total | 35,000 |

A. K. Roop, Jr., *Planning Engineer.*

---

OFFICE OF CITY MANAGER MEMO

*Breakdown of estimate*

| | |
|---|---|
| Planning—additional employees including field parties | $22,000 |
| Sewage and water studies | 25,000 |
| Aerial survey | 28,000 |
| Total | 75,000 |

---

CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

*Survey of regional and local planning needs in the Washington region under the proposed program for dispersal of Federal Buildings*

I. STATUS OF EXISTING PLANS FOR ALEXANDRIA

(*a*) The existing land-use maps are not sufficiently detailed for use in over-all planning. There is an existing zoning plan in Alexandria.

(*b*) There is a general plan for the location of future major and secondary streets in the city but this plan does not include any expressway or freeway types.

(*c*) The present subdivision control regulations were revised in 1950 and we feel that they are adequate to control any local development which may occur due to the dispersal program.

(*d*) There is no satisfactory map of existing public lands and there is no plan showing general locations for future requirements for parks, parkways, recreation areas, schools, and public institutions.

(*e*) There are plans under way at the present time for a study of water-supply and sewage-disposal problems in the area.

II. PRINCIPLE PLANNING PROBLEMS

(*a*) In general, base maps and planning data are not sufficient for use in revising existing plans for thoroughfares, population distribution, public and private land use, etc.

(*b*) Subdivision controls are adequate. The zoning law is in the process of revision and should be adequate when revised.

(*c*) It will be necessary to make entirely new studies for community facilities such as schools, etc.

III. COLLABORATION ON PLANNING PROBLEMS

(*a*) I believe the above questions generally cover the field of planning in which there should be collaboration between the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the city of Alexandria.

(*b*) It is estimated that in order to meet the above problems, there will probably be needed at least $75,000 for planning purposes. Local finance resources are not available to meet this need.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

*Survey of regional and local planning needs in the Washington region under the proposed program for dispersal of Federal buildings, northern Virginia area, January 31, 1951*

ANSWERS FROM LOUDON COUNTY

I. STATUS OF EXISTING PLANS FOR EACH PLANNING JURISDICTION

(*a*) *Land use*

Are existing land use maps available and has a zoning plan been adopted? Yes.

(*b*) *Highways and thoroughfares*

Is there a general plan for the location of future highways and thoroughfares, especially of the expressway and parking type, which would be of value in the location of new Federal projects? This has been considered unnecessary since this is a rural county.

(*c*) *Subdivision control*

Are subdivision regulations in force and adequate to control extensive local development which may result from the dispersal program? Is there an approved highway plan with which subdivision plats must conform? Yes.

(*d*) *Public reservations*

Is there a map of existing public lands in the area and a plan showing the general locations for estimated future land requirements for parks, parkways, recreation areas, schools, and public institutions? No public recreational facilities—only private.

(*e*) *Public utilities or services*

Are plans or reports available covering such problem as future water supply, sewage collection and disposal, such as would be required for any extensive local development stimulated by the dispersal program? No.

II. PRINCIPLE PLANNING PROBLEMS OR NEEDS TO BE CREATED BY THE DISPERSAL PROGRAM

(*a*) *Review of existing plans*

In general, are base maps and planning data sufficiently up to date and complete to be useful in revising existing plans for thoroughfares, population distribution, public and private land use, community facilities and services? Yes.

(*b*) *Adequacy of planning controls*

Are existing subdivision and zoning controls sufficiently adequate to regulate new developments which will be immediately stimulated when dispersal decisions are made? Are they adequate to bring about sound community growth and prevent haphazard road-side development? Yes, but we cannot control type of building.

(*c*) *Community facilities and services*

Will it probably be necessary to make entirely new studies or plans for community facilities, such as schools, water supply, sewage collection and disposal, etc.? Yes—the county is already overtaxed.

III. COLLABORATION ON PLANNING PROBLEMS IN THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA AREA

(*a*) Do the above questions generally cover the fields of planning in which there should be collaboration between the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission and its constituent agencies for the extension of revision of regional plans or are there other subjects which should be included? If so, what are they? Already answered.

(*b*) Roughly, what additional costs will be required to meet the above problems and can local financial resources be made immediately available to meet the impact of the initial planning program? There would probably be no local money. A tentative estimate of needs would be $50,000.

ARLINGTON COUNTY, VA., *February 6, 1951.*

Memorandum in reply to questionnaire at meeting of general services representatives with planning agencies of northern Virginia at the City Hall, Alexandria, Va., on February 6, 1951.

I. STATUS OF EXISTING PLANS FOR EACH PLANNING JURISDICTION

(*a*) Land use: Yes.
(*b*) Highways and thoroughfares: Yes.
(*c*) Subdivision control: Yes.
(*d*) Public reservation: Yes.
(*e*) Public utilities and services: Yes.

II. PRINCIPLE PLANNING PROBLEMS OR NEEDS TO BE CREATED BY DISPERSAL PROGRAM

(*a*) *Review of existing plans.*—In general, the plans of Arlington County are up to date, but, undoubtedly, some restudies and revisions would be required in the thoroughfare plans, and all detail plans would have to be made on major thoroughfares affected by the location of a particular building.

(*b*) *Adequacy of planning controls.*—Planning controls are generally adequate as we have a subdivision control ordinance as well as a highway construction ordinance which controls the development of these features.

(*c*) *Community facilities and services.*—Restudies and new studies will have to be made in connection with the schools, water supply, and sewage collection and disposal should a building be located within Arlington.

III. COLLABORATION ON PLANNING PROBLEMS IN THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA AREA

(*a*) The questions generally cover the fields of planning which should be collaborated with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission through the Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission. Since Arlington is so close in to the District of Columbia, it is not thought possible that a building or buildings will be located within its area of 24 miles, no point of which is more than 6 miles from the zero milestone. However, it is believed that the county plans will be greatly affected, especially as to the expressways and thoroughfares that will be developed on account of any buildings located within the Virginia area. We are anxious that in this development ample access be provided to and from the county highway system so that the county will not be isolated by such development.

(*b*) Roughly, it is estimated that the cost to the planning division of the Department of Public Service of Arlington County will be about $15,000 to properly care for the studies necessary should the dispersal bill be passed.

This money is not now available within the county budget and could not be provided at this time. New budget becomes effective July 1, 1951.

We are attaching copies of statements filed with the Subcommittee on Public Buildings of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, when hearings were being held on S. 218, the dispersal bill.

Submitted by C. L. Kinnier, planning engineer, Arlington County.

STATEMENT BY THE ARLINGTON COUNTY BOARD ON UNITED STATES SENATE BILL 218, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

(February 1 revision to January 30, 1951, statement)

ARLINGTON COUNTY AND THE FEDERAL OFFICES DISPERSAL PROGRAM

By the very nature of the site specifications so far made public with respect to the proposed dispersal and decentralization plan, Arlington County does not anticipate the location of a Federal installation within the county limits. Neither the distance nor time requirements can be met locally, and few open buildable sites of suitable size remain available. Therefore, the county is not reviewing its facilities with the thought of providing for such an installation.

However, Arlington will be directly affected by the proposed dispersal even though the sites are beyond her boundaries. Preliminary studies indicate that the major resultant factors influencing the future of the county include the following: transportation routes and facilities, water supply and sanitation, and future regional land-use patterns, with emphasis on zoning and park development.

It is granted that Arlington County is a corridor area, as well as a residential community, since all routes across the Potomac into the District of Columbia pass through the county. It is also acknowledged that limited-access highways will be essential between the Capital and the satellite offices. One such limited-access highway, Shirley Highway, Route 350, exists through the county, going in a southwestern direction. Another highway, leading to the west, Lee Boulevard, Route 50, can be readily converted to limited-access use. George Washington Memorial Parkway, now under construction, offers a future radial thoroughfare to the north. The continued development of Arlington Mill Drive along Four Mile Run will give a limited-access cross-county connection from Alexandria and the National Airport direct to United States Route No. 50. The location for such a highway in a northwesterly direction, connecting with Route 7, must be studied. However, these highways must not be permitted to become traffic sluiceways which would isolate Arlington completely from passing traffic or would divide the county into unconnected parts. These highways will profoundly affect the street-use patterns, residential neighborhoods, and commercial developments in the county and could cause blight. Coordination of dispersal communication needs and basic county development is imperative, and must be planned in advance, if Arlington is to continue as a healthy dormitory community for Federal employees and as a home community for its permanent residents.

Water supply and sanitation for these dispersal sites will also affect Arlington. The burden placed on regional resources and facilities by the proposed installations, added to the problems of the joint regional effort now under study, will need careful analysis to assure equitable distribution between the old and the new communities. Civil defense requirements necessitate an ample and constant water supply, and prudence will require a separate source independent of the District of Columbia. This problem particularly affects Arlington, now getting all of its water by pipe across Chain Bridge from the Federal water supply. Regional water sources should be developed in close cooperation between the dispersal sites engineers and the neighboring Virginia communities to provide ample and reserve supplies for all and to prevent either unnecessary supply duplication or vulnerable distribution systems. Regional sewage disposal must be solved so that a breakdown anywhere will not result in pollution and possible pestilence in the adjoining areas.

Regional land-use patterns, as they develop under the stimulus of decentralization, are of great interest to Arlington. Haphazard control, with resulting string developments, will result in placing greater loads on local highways and make for uneconomic elongation of the water and sewer facilities of all the existing communities. This will hold true also for school facilities and police and fire protection. Furthermore, Arlington is concerned with the provision of regional parks and open spaces, not only because of their recognized place in living conditions, but also because of their vital role in civil defense by providing evacuation and shelter areas. Arlington County is rapidly approaching a state of completely urban development and this urbanization is spreading across and beyond its boundaries. As a result, sufficient open space will not be available within or immediately adjacent to the county to provide the necessary dispersal areas for the local citizens in time of emergency. It is vital that these areas be provided at not too great a distance from the county line. Also, local parkway access must be provided to permit wholesale evacuation in all directions, unhampered by narrow bottlenecks through random, uncontrolled housing developments. It is mandatory that the local communities, with State assistance and Federal cooperation, develop and exercise strong zoning and subdivision controls, under the supervision of active local planning agencies to secure the required orderly and open developments indicated.

It is understood that, in speaking of the needs of the dispersal sites, these needs include the probable private developments that will automatically follow the completion of the Federal installations. An immediate demand will arise from the Federal personnel for more conveniently located housing, and future planning must anticipate accelerated new community growth, with concurrent utility and facility requirements.

Although these housing developments may not be within this county, Arlington distinctly feels that good planning is an essential factor in providing for those oft-stated rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Therefore, it cannot be too strongly stressed that basic coordinated planning is required by Federal, State, and local authorities in order to achieve the maximum amenities for living and work, and, possibly, survival, not only adjacent to the actual dispersed building sites but within the entire metropolitan region.

Arlington County supports the recommendation of the Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission that Federal funds be made available under S. 218 to the several local governments for advance and detailed planning studies on the effects to be anticipated by the dispersal and the optimum solutions, so that the final regional development can be guided in an orderly and economic fashion.

Reference has been made to the provisions of Senate bill, S. 349, the proposed Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as the medium through which financial assistance could be made available to political subdivisions whose economic development would be affected by the provisions of S. 218. A review of S. 349 reveals that it is broad in scope, and that the provisions might possibly be interpreted or construed to include assistance of the type it is believed Arlington County and other local communities should have for planning facilities and services incident to the proposed dispersal plan and which it is believed should be extended to any political subdivision whose normal economy may be affected by the proposed decentralization program. However, S. 349 is limited to community facilities and services in areas in which defense housing is required. This immediately raises the question of (*a*) whether or not S. 218 is to be construed or specifically defined as a defense measure, (*b*) whether community facilities and services which obviously will be consequent to the dispersal and decentralization program will be defined as an integral part of defense housing, and (*c*) whether the term "areas" will not be limited to the immediate vicinity of the defense housing, without regard to the abnormal economic impact on the region surrounding the immediate defense areas. Furthermore, S. 349 contains no provision for grants to potentially affected political subdivisions for planning purposes. It is therefore submitted that for the protection of the taxpayers in such political subdivisions, consideration should be given either to making S. 218 financially self-sufficient or to requiring a concurrent study of S. 218 and S. 349 to insure that they are financially complementary. It is believed the recommendation made at the hearing January 30 that the first sentence of section 3 of S. 318 be amended by adding after the word "act" the words "and for grants-in-aid for over-all planning purposes to political subdivisions whose economic development is affected by the provisions of this act," supplies an initial step to make the proposed act self-sufficient, and that the study suggested above may reveal the necessity for further amendment if the potentialities of the program are to be looked upon as a national financial obligation rather than that of individual political subdivisions which are the legatees of its provisions.

To crystallize the above considerations into definite form for possible action, a suggested amendment to the basic S. 218 is herewith presented for review and concurrence by the Subcommittee on Public Buildings, Senate Committee on Public Works. This amendment can either be made a part of the first section or become section 2:

"To protect the said sites, their installations and communications, from encroachments and disorderly development that may reduce their usefulness as intended by the Congress, and to promote the health and welfare of both the local communities affected by this program and that of the Federal personnel assigned to the installations, the Administrator of General Services is directed to work with the appropriate State and local authorities and to take such action as may be deemed necessary to establish comprehensive planning and such land-use control as permitted under existing State enabling legislation to the end that economic and equitable distribution of facilities and services can be achieved in the metropolitan region and orderly development accomplished on the private lands surrounding or adjacent to the said buildings, highways, and off-site facilities authorized under this bill. The Administrator of General Services is further directed to make grants-in-aid from such moneys as may be appropriated herein to the several local authorities to assist in such over-all planning studies as may be additionally necessitated by said Federal building dispersal; provided that no moneys so granted shall be used for building, housing, or facility design or construction."

The Arlington County board will seek an opportunity to be heard by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency while S. 349 is under consideration, but without too much optimism over the probability of its eventually containing specific provision for the assistance believed needed in connection with the activities contemplated under S. 218, or over the enactment of S. 349 in such time or shape as to assure concurrent orderly economic development without an undue burden on the taxpayers of Arlington.

(Mrs.) Florence Cannon,
*Chairman, Arlington County Board.*

## Fairfax County, Va.

*Survey of regional and local planning needs in the Washington region under the proposed program for dispersal of Federal buildings, northern Virginia area*

January 31, 1951.

### I. STATUS OF EXISTING PLANS FOR EACH PLANNING JURISDICTION

(*a*) *Land use*

Are existing land use maps available? No.

Has a zoning plan been adopted? Yes.

(*b*) *Highways and thoroughfares*

Is there a general plan for the location of future highways and thoroughfares, especially of the expressway and parking type which would be of value in the location of new Federal projects? Tentative—in preparation.

(*c*) *Subdivision control*

Are subdivision regulations in force and adequate to control extensive local development which may result from the dispersal program? Yes, but inadequate personnel to control.

Is there an approved highway plan with which subdivision plats must conform? No.

(*d*) *Public reservations*

Is there a map of existing public lands in the area and a plan showing the general locations for estimated future land requirements for parks, parkways, recreation areas, schools, and public institutions? No.

(*e*) *Public utilities or services*

Are plans or reports available covering such problems as future water supply, sewage collection and disposal, such as would be required for any extensive local development stimulated by the dispersal program? No.

### II. PRINCIPAL PLANNING PROBLEMS OR NEEDS TO BE CREATED BY THE DISPERSAL PROGRAM

(*a*) *Review of existing plans*

In general, are base maps and planning data sufficiently up to date and complete to be useful in revising existing plans for thoroughfares, population distribution, public and private land use, community facilities and services? No.

(*b*) *Adequacy of planning controls*

Are existing subdivision and zoning controls sufficiently adequate to regulate new developments which will be immediately stimulated when dispersal decisions are made? Yes; but inadequate personnel to enforce.

Are they adequate to bring about sound community growth and prevent haphazard roadside development? Yes.

(*c*) *Community facilities and services*

Will it probably be necessary to make entirely new studies or plans for community facilities, such as schools, water supply, sewage collection and disposal, etc.? Yes.

### III. COLLABORATION ON PLANNING PROBLEMS IN THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA AREA

(*a*) Do the above questions generally cover the fields of planning in which there should be collaboration between the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Northern Virginia Regional Planning Commission and its constituent agencies for the extension of revision of regional plans or are there other subjects which should be included? Yes.

(*b*) Roughly, what additional costs will be required to meet the above problems and can local financial resources be made immediately available to meet the impact of the initial planning program? No local finances.

(*c*) *Public utilities or services*

There are no plans or reports presented available covering such problems as future water supply and sewage collection and disposal, such as would be required for any extensive local development stimulated by the dispersal program.

Inasmuch as it is apparently proposed that the dispersal units would be located outside of a 20-mile limit from the center of Washington, D. C., only the most rural areas of Fairfax County would be available for the development of such units. In these areas, however, there are no water supply and sewerage facilities of the type required for these units or for the development of urban areas surround-

ing such units presently existing, nor have any such facilities been planned for these areas. It would seem logical, if at all possible, to channel any influx of population resulting from a dispersal program to already established communities within the county in which water supply and sewerage facilities are either presently available or could be provided at a much lesser cost than developing entirely new sources. In any event, the financial resources of the county will not permit the development of plans to meet the expected impact of the dispersal program insofar as water supply and sewerage facilities are concerned.

Quite apart from the proposed dispersal program and its effect upon the county, the county has visualized the necessity of developing a more comprehensive approach to the matter of providing additional and improved water supply and sewerage facilities for the county as a whole. Toward this end, the county has very recently appointed a committee to study the feasibility of solving these problems through the creation of a Fairfax County sanitation authority which would operate in a manner very similar to the operation of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, now serving the areas of Maryland immediately adjoining the city of Washington, D. C. This authority, when created, would be amply endowed with the powers to provide increased and improved sanitary facilities. It would, however, require the appropriation of a substantial amount of funds for the preparation of the necessary studies and reports to place it into effective operation.

Based upon the employment of additional personnel in the office of the sanitary engineer of the county and the engagement of consulting engineering services for special studies and reports, it is felt that the minimum sum of $23,000 would be required to prepare for the solution of the water supply and sewerage facility problems that are expected to be brought by the realization of the dispersal program.

---

WORK NECESSARY TO BE DONE TO COMPLETE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, FAIRFAX COUNTY, VA.

(*a*) Complete base map of county showing roads and subdivisions only (60 percent of county now complete in this respect).

(*b*) Complete land-use survey and map.

(*c*) Complete zoning study and revised map.

(*d*) Necessary revision of zoning regulations in conjunction with (*c*).

(*e*) Thoroughfare, parkway, and collector street study and plan (tentative plan just begun).

(*f*) Master plan of parks, recreational areas, schools, etc.

*Estimated work program for necessary personnel to complete comprehensive master plan, Fairfax County*

| | *Hours* |
|---|---|
| (*a*) Existing conditions map (base map of roads and subdivisions): | |
| 1. 40 sheets to complete (scale 1 inch = 600 feet) at 60 hours each | 2,400 |
| (*b*) Land use map: | |
| 1. General (from aerial photos) 90 sheets at 20 hours each | 1,800 |
| 2. Detailed (in urban and suburban areas plus isolated cases in rural areas not discernible from photos, to be done by field survey). Estimated 200 square miles at 140 hours per 10 square miles (2 men per vehicle at 70 hours per 10 square miles or 1 square mile per day) = 200 days at 14 hours each (2 men per vehicle) | 2,800 |
| 3. Drafting of detailed land use (90 sheets at 30 hours each) | 2,700 |
| (*c*) Zoning study and revised map plus zoning ordinance revision | 1,000 |
| 1. Population density and distribution, average lot areas in existing subdivisions, commercial and industrial needs, and locations). | |
| (*d*) Completion of thoroughfare, parkway, and collector street study and plan: | |
| 1. General thoroughfare plan on contour maps (scale 1 inch = 1,320 feet) | 200 |
| 2. Contours traced on sepia of all base sheets (1 inch = 660 feet), 90 sheets at 15 hours each | 1,350 |
| 3. Completion of plan (studies and drafting) based on (1) and (2) | 1,000 |
| (*e*) Plan of parks, recreational areas, and schools (completion of data and drafting) | 2,000 |
| Total | 15,250 |

*Estimate of cost of preparation of comprehensive master plan for Fairfax County in connection with proposed dispersal*

| | |
|---|---|
| I. Consultant, 100 days at $100 per day | $10,000 |
| II. Director of work program (experienced) to act as liaison between consultant and workers: 2 years at $5,500 per year | 11,000 |
| III. Office equipment and supplies | 2,000 |
| IV. Reproductions, printing, enlargements, etc | 2,000 |
| V. Transportation cost (gasoline and oil only) in re preparation of plan: | |
| (*a*) Land-use survey in field (200 days, 6.6 months at $50 per month) | 330 |
| (*b*) Other | 1,000 |
| (*a*) and (*b*) does not include cost of vehicle or use of more than one vehicle. | |
| VI. Drafting and data compilation personnel (15,250 hours at $2.42 per hour) | 36,905 |
| Total (estimated maximum) | 63,235 |
| VII. Aerial photos (mosaic and contact prints at 1 inch=200 feet) | 25,000 |
| Total estimated minimum cost: (no allowance for contingencies) | 88,235 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Estimated annual average salary of drafting and data compilation personnel, $4,000 per year: | |
| Days per year | 365 |
| Saturday and Sunday | −104 |
| Total | 261 |
| Estimated days per year sickness | −15 |
| Total | 246 |
| Holidays | −10 |
| Working days | 236 |
| Working hours per day | 7 |
| Working hours per year at average annual salary of $4,000—$2.42 per working hour | 1,652 |

*Additional permanent personnel to carry out plan and enforcement regulations*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 planning technician at $4,000 per year | $4,000 |
| 2 street and drainage construction inspectors at $3,900 | 7,800 |
| 1 draftsman at $3,800 | 3,800 |
| | 15,600 |
| Total existing budget (yearly) | [1] 36,565 |
| Total yearly budget required | 52,165 |

[1] See the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| Salaries | $32,200 |
| Transportation allowance | 2,500 |
| Office supplies, equipment, etc | 1,365 |
| Miscellaneous expenses | 500 |
| Total | 36,565 |

Total staff: 8 and director. Present duties of staff: (*a*) Zoning administration (4); (*b*) enforcement of subdivision control ordinance including checking and approval of subdivision plats, street plans and profiles, and drainage plans plus inspection and installation of same; (*c*) current work in endeavor to keep up with current rapid development; (*d*) compilation of data and studies in re (*c*).

*Fairfax County breakdown of estimate*

| | |
|---|---|
| Planning: Consultant and additional employees | $88,235 |
| Sewage and sanitation studies | 23,000 |
| Total | 111,235 |
| Additional permanent employees (per year) | 15,600 |

NORTHERN VIRGINIA REGIONAL PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

COUNTIES OF ARLINGTON, FAIRFAX, PRINCE WILLIAM, AND LOUDOUN, CITIES OF ALEXANDRIA AND FALLS CHURCH, TOWN OF MANASSAS

FEBRUARY 8, 1951.

Re H. R. 1728, S. 218 dispersal program.

HONORABLE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS,
*House of Representatives Subcommitte on Public Works,*
*Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.*

GENTLEMEN: The Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission, whose membership includes the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Prince William, and Loudoun, the cities of Alexandria and Falls Church, and the town of Manassas, is concerned with the proper planning and economic development of the northern Virginia communities. We are appreciative of the opportunity which you have extended us today to present our views on a subject of such vital concern to us. The commission has considered the proposed dispersal program of the Federal Government with respect to the impact upon its constituent communities which is likely to result from the adoption of this program, and after consultation with the interested officials of these communities offers you the benefit of its opinion in the matter.

We recognize that the adoption of a program which would provide dispersal units at locations outside of a 20-mile limit from Washington, D. C., which presumably could mean the selection of one or more such sites in northern Virginia, might well adversely affect the welfare of community life in northern Virginia if the sites were chosen without proper regard to the nature and extent of the problems which will be associated therewith or created thereby. It is generally agreed, however, that with an assurance on the part of the Federal Government, in cooperation with local governmental agencies, that concurrent planning for the prevention of the creation or the solution of these problems and the immediate or subsequent financial assistance to provide any necessary community facilities will be provided, the establishment of such dispersal units in certain parts of northern Virginia would not adversely affect the welfare of the citizens of the areas.

The problems of the development of adequate water-supply and sewage-disposal systems, highway and thoroughfare plans, population distribution, land use, park, and recreational facilities, schools and other community facilities, all will require a considerable amount of advance or concurrent planning if adverse effects are to be eliminated or minimized. Our commission has consulted its constituent members to determine the nature and extent of these planning problems and has learned that all of these members are aware of the impelling necessity to gird themselves for the planning efforts which will be required; yet, none of them are presently financially able to convert their desires or responsibilities into effective action. Assuming that a part of the funds required for this purpose could be made available by local governmental agencies, the peculiarities of including appropriations in budgets and securing the required revenue from taxation would prevent any funds from becoming available before January 1, 1952. This could well result in a situation of "being too late with too little." In cooperation with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, we have circulated a questionnaire relating to the planning problems that will be associated with the proposed dispersal program, and we attach hereto for your consideration a copy of the questionnaire and copies of the replies that were received from the various constituent members of our Commission. Without knowing the actual location of the sites that may be chosen in northern Virginia for the establishment of dispersal units, it is, of course, impossible to develop any detailed estimates of the cost of preparing the necessary planning studies; but, being aware of the effect that may result upon already established communities in northern Virginia from this program, the constituent members have estimated the cost of undertaking the planning studies in each of the jurisdictions. A summation of these figures reveals that a sum of $350,000 is expected to be needed to commence the preparation of the necessary planning studies to assure the timely and proper solution of the problems that will certainly be created or accentuated in each of the various communities.

Our commission has reviewed the suggestion of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission to secure an amendment to the legislation as presently proposed, which we understand was presented to you at a recent hearing on this

subject, and we find that this amendment is specifically designed to provide assurance that the planning aspects of the dispersal program, as they relate to local communities, will not be overlooked in the maze of other associated problems. The commission endorses the amendment as proposed for the following reasons:

1. It is vital to the interest of the communities which may be affected by the dispersal program that care be exercised in the location of these dispersal units and that adequate planning for the accompanying residential and business development be provided in order that the communities may not find themselves saddled with incongruous and undesirable development entirely out of keeping with the general plan which each community is now attempting to follow.

2. In the northern Virginia area, especially in Fairfax and Prince William Counties, a serious problem in regard to providing adequate water-supply and sewage-disposal facilities now exists, and this problem should receive an immediate and thorough study in order that needless expense on the part of either the local communities or the Federal Government may be avoided.

3. Most of the northern Virginia communities are still suffering from the effects of the rapid expansion brought about by World War II and the subsequent activities of the Federal Government in Washington, D. C., and they do not have available funds or personnel for the planning which will be necessary to properly cope with the problems to be associated with the disposal program. For this reason, the provision of the amendment dealing with allocations of funds to the local communities is of paramount importance.

4. Any attempt to include such an amendment in later legislation would defeat the purpose of the provision which is to insure that planning will take place coincident with the actual decisions, rather than to have the decisions made first and the local jurisdictions be forced to alter their established plans to encompass an accomplished fact.

We believe that we would be remiss in the discharge of our responsibilities if we did not emphatically stress the importance of considering the local planning aspects of this dispersal program and urge the inclusion of the appropriate language in the pending legislation to assure proper regard thereto. We respectfully trust that you gentlemen will concur in our belief that the interest of both the Federal Government and the various local governments under the avowed purpose of the legislation will be better served if the amendment suggested by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission is incorporated in the legislation as enacted.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN W. BROOKFIELD, *Chairman.*

Mr. TRIMBLE. Are there any questions?

Mr. PICKETT. If you had the $350,000 available today, how long would it take you to be ready with your version of the plan so that if this authorization is passed the folks would be able to go ahead with the construction?

Mr. CORBALIS. If we could assume at the same time we would know the locations of the buildings, I think we could be ready in a year's time. That would be the majority of the basic plan.

Mr. PICKETT. The effect of your position is that if you are going to be given a voice in the planning proposition we must delay actual construction and implementation of this proposed authorization for about a year before we start it?

Mr. CORBALIS. No. I mean to infer the planning can be carried on coincident with the actual construction of the buildings, so that at the time the buildings would be completed and ready for occupancy the associated problems that would be brought to the local communities by increased facilities required for housing could pretty well be outlined.

Mr. PICKETT. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MCGREGOR. You include in your planning the highways leading to these buildings; do you not?

Mr. CORBALIS. No, sir. We assume that the principal highways would be included as part of the Federal Government's responsibility

in the matter. Our planning would be for the secondary-highway pattern, for those persons who would settle in the northern Virginia area.

Mr. McGREGOR. Is it not true that you would want to have something to say in connection with the main arterial highways in line with your access roads?

Mr. CORBALIS. Very much, sir.

Mr. McGREGOR. How long would it take you to have your plans ready for the access roads? I think you realize if you start building you should start the approaches to the buildings so that there will be highways ready when the building is completed.

Mr. CORBALIS. I would think 90 days to 6 months. We would have the benefit in that instance, I am sure, of the State highway department, because it would be a major thoroughfare.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. SMITH. The next witness is Mr. John W. Brookfield, chairman, Northern Virginia Regional Planning and Economic Development Commission.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Brookfield, we are happy to have you here. You may make whatever statement you care to make for the record.

Do you have any additional testimony to give the committee in addition to that which Mr. Corbalis has given?

## STATEMENT OF JOHN W. BROOKFIELD, CHAIRMAN, NORTHERN VIRGINIA REGIONAL PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Mr. BROOKFIELD. No; we have no special information to give you, except that I have a map showing the principal locations in the counties. It is possible we may be able to file this with your committee.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Give it to the reporter, please. We will be glad to have it.

Thank you very much. Is there anyone else from Virginia?

Now we are happy to hear from our colleague, the gentleman from Virginia.

## STATEMENT OF HON. HOWARD W. SMITH, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SMITH. I will make my statement quite brief, because I have very little to add to what has already been said. I am happy to see that the committee is taking seriously into consideration the matter of the planning for these buildings in the surrounding areas.

I am quite familiar with what has happened in this metropolitan area on the Virginia side, where much of it has grown like Topsy in years gone by without any planning. Those communities are suffering very much now from the lack of adequate planning as the buildings went along.

I do hope that the committee, and I am sure you will, give serious consideration to the necessity for local planning and collaboration with the local authorities out there.

I think that the committee should also give consideration to the collaboration with the authorities in the determination of sites. We had that question up when the bill to build the new airport was here.

We put in on the floor a provision requiring that they should at least consult with the local authorities before they dumped this great thing right in the middle of them. I am inclined to believe something of that kind should go in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, what I wanted particularly to talk to you about is the purchase of sites for this program. I think that every department of our Government is too extravagant in the matter of the purchase of land.

They seem to go around and buy up land just for the fun of buying it. If you will make a survey of the situation, and I can give you a brief statement of some of the available properties, you will find that the Government owns a great deal of property in this area now that is not serving any very useful purpose, and from which you could very well cut off sufficient chunks to do what you want with the matter of locating whatever sites you want to locate in Virginia.

Of course, we all know whenever the Government needs to buy any real estate, as soon as the noise gets around, the prices go up and it costs the Government a good deal more money that it would probably cost someone else.

I wanted to take this opportunity to tell you briefly about some of the land that the Government owns right now within 20 and 30 miles of the District line, and available to good roads.

Before I do that may I throw out this thought? You will recall that last summer there was a great flurry that we must build a new supplemental airport immediately, if not sooner. That bill could not wait until after the recess of Congress, it had to be passed then, because that thing had to be done.

That bill was passed last summer. Six months later the airport had not been built, the airport has not been started, and the sites has not been selected. I do not say that is anybody's fault, but it is a fact.

When you are considering this program I think some consideration should be given to the question of where that airport is going to be, because you do not want to put these buildings down in the middle of the airport.

I happen to be living almost under one now, and I find it most disconcerting both day and night. I do not think you want to get the Government buildings too close to your supplemental airport.

And some consideration ought to be given to the planning of the respective locations of both of them, instead of the Civil Aeronautics going in one direction and this committee going in another.

Of course, you gentlemen have observed this is a very wide-open bill that you have here. If the committee recommends it as it is written, most anything can happen. I am not sure whether you can move the seat of government down into Brother Pickett's State of Texas, but you can do almost anything else under this bill as written. Whether you want to put any limitations on that is within the good judgment of this committee.

I brought this map along because it illustrates one possibility. Gentlemen, that map is a map of the Prince William Forest Park. That area is situated just beyond the so-called Shirley Highway. It is close to the Quantico area where the Government owns a large slice of ground. That is largely wooded ground. This is included in the area. It is within a good driving distance of Washington, probably a little over the 20-mile limit.

Mr. McGregor. What is the brown area?

Mr. Smith. That area is an area of 15,000 acres. It is enough to build all the Government buildings you would want to build and leave enough over for park and recreation.

Mr. Trimble. I do not think you got Harry's question. He is bothered that part of the map is brown and part of it is green.

Mr. McGregor. What is the brown section at the bottom of the map, Judge?

Mr. Smith. That is surplus property that the park has not any use for. It has put some legislation through to permit them to give it to Quantico, which is adjacent to it.

Quantico, which is a Marine base, owns in the three adjoining counties 50,000 acres, within about 30 miles of Washington.

I do not know what they do with all that 50,000 acres. They have it. This is purely a park area. It is serving no useful purpose except recreation, and to cut off a few hundred acres here or there would not damage the park.

As a matter of fact, these areas here that are shown in red are outside of what they call the watershed of the park. I recently introduced legislation at the request of the Park Service to permit them to sell those pieces off.

I am always happy to see a department willing to relinquish something. I think it is a fine sign, and I am enthusiastic about letting them do it.

So, there is 15,000 acres there, there is 50,000 acres here, which belongs to the Government. When you come back farther up the Shirley Highway you will find that you run into the area of Fort Belvoir, formerly known as Camp Humphrey.

How many acres are there?

Mr. Corbalis. It is approximately 11,000.

Mr. Smith. So, if you come back up Shirley you come up to this large spotted area. I am informed by Mr. Corbalis, who is from Fairfax County and is one of the officials there, there is 11,000 acres owned there by the Government. Much of it is woodland not being used for any useful purpose. I believe it crosses Shirley Highway or is close by. That is within about 18 miles from the District of Columbia.

You will notice these spotted areas over here on the map are also large areas owned by the Federal Government. This area is called Centerville, where I put the pencil. That is about 20 miles from the District line.

And right at Bull Run, I would say a couple of miles farther on, is what is known as the Manassas Battlefield Park. The Government went in there and acquired, under the submarginal land program, several thousand acres to mark the old Bull Run battlefield. It is now used as a park. There are several thousand acres of that. Hundreds of acres of that was bought because they happened to be a part of the battlefield over which the Yankees ran. It is serving no useful purpose at this time.

Mr. Trimble. Mr. Reporter, be sure and get that in the record.

Mr. Smith. Maybe we better leave that out. I may have to appeal to somebody before we are through.

Along Bull Run there are several thousand acres purchased by the Government which is serving no useful purpose in the world.

I am just putting to you, as a practical proposition, why not use some of that land we have already instead of paying more of the taxpayers' money to buy more land which takes it out of taxation and causes the communities to suffer?

There are doubtless in there, other areas large and small, that the Government owns. Nobody ever says anything to me about it, but I read in the newspaper that some department of Uncle Sam has gone out into my district in recent weeks and bought some more land and has established an agency over there.

If we are going to establish some agencies over there, let us establish them on ground that the Government owns. I hope it is given consideration.

If you do think that is a matter for serious consideration, I wonder if you ought not to have an amendment in the bill that would require agencies to use land that is already available and wherever it is feasible to do so?

For instance, take the Bull Run battlefield area. It lies right along Bull Run. Within a mile or two of there is a natural-gas line where you could get the fuel right close to them. Ample water supply could be obtained from Bull Run. There is a divided highway, Route 211, which runs within a mile and a half of it. The rest of Route 211 is through that area, and is programed now for widening by the State highway department.

Down here at Prince William Park, which would be in this area on this paper, right in here, [indicating], there is a natural-gas line that runs through there. The water system for the Marine Corps could be tapped here.

You would have very little trouble getting ample supply. The same is true with the water supply at Fort Belvoir. There is a natural-gas line that runs roughly parallel to this highway that you see marked on there, within a mile or two of that place. You have practically every facility already there, and the Government owns it. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Are there any questions?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Nothing, except I want to compliment the judge and thank him very much for coming before the committee and calling our attention to some of these facts.

We probably should know them but, as the judge knows, we do not know everything. We are happy, judge, you called it to our attention.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I would like to inquire if there are any members of the Capital Park and Planning Commission of Maryland here in order that we may see if there is a comparable situation in Maryland. Evidently there are none here.

Mr. SCUDDER. I am very much interested in the statements that the judge has made. I believe we should explore every piece of Government property that is located within a reasonable distance of Washington, and, if necessary, amend the bill to require that the agency acquire those properties where they are reasonably available and fit into the over-all program.

I do not believe we should purchase additional land if we can utilize existing Government property. I believe we can save millions of dollars if we can locate these installations near an existent highway. I am very much in accord with the suggestion of the gentleman from Virginia. I have been over the Manassas battlefield a good many

times. I think the location is ideal for such use. I believe we might as well put it to some useful benefit of the Government rather than maintain it at Government expense.

Mr. BRAY. In spite of the remarks about the Yankees running over there, I enjoyed your statement very much.

In all seriousness, if you can think of any ways in which we can stop the record of the bureaucratic spending of people's money, we will be very happy to hear from you any time.

I think you have offered a fine suggestion. I will give it careful consideration.

Mr. SMITH. I would like to cooperate with you in stopping some of this Government spending. We can do it on the floor of the House if we stand up and are not concerned about spending too much money down in our own districts.

That is where the trouble is. As one of my friends remarked to me, "We are all ready to give the shirt off the other fellow's back, but when it comes to our own district it is not so good."

Mr. PICKETT. I would like to endorse thoroughly Congressman Smith's position on the matter, including his reference to Bull Run.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Are there any other witnesses from Virginia?

Mr. McKeever, would you like to make a statement? We cut you off a little while ago.

Mr. MCKEEVER. No. My statement is in the letter that Mr. Nolen has written to you.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much.

Mr. Green, in view of what has developed, I wish the Bureau would secure a map and superimpose on it all the Government owned land within the Maryland-Virginia area. Fix it up plain and easy like so even the chairman of this subcommittee can understand it.

Mr. GREEN. We will be glad to furnish that to the committee.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Within 20 or 30 miles radius.

Mr. PICKETT. Run it out to 30 so we can see how much we have.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Congressman Sasscer.

## STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE LANSDALE G. SASSCER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, as the Representative of a nearby Maryland area, I would like to leave a few thoughts with the committee for consideration in connection with the pending dispersal plan.

If the atomic hazard is imminent, the 2- or 3-year delay incident to the construction of permanent buildings and the supplying of utilities would not answer the problem. The indications are that this world crisis will either crystallize or clear up before the expiration of the contemplated 3-year period necessary for the construction of the permanent buildings under the dispersal program. I therefore suggest that temporary quarters in the same area be either rented or constructed for the removal of just such records and operations as would be necessary to provide a continuity of Government functions should an atomic attack occur. In either event, whether the problem is to be approached through the construction of permanent or temporary buildings, I strongly urge that Government land, of which

there is a vast amount not in use in Maryland, be utilized, and in that I concur in the suggestion of my colleague, Mr. Smith, from Virginia.

I call to your attention the vast Government ownership adjacent to Greenbelt, the Beltsville Research Center, the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, the Naval Training Center at Bainbridge, the Naval Air Station at Patuxent River, Fort George G. Meade, the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge, the Naval Powder Factory, and Suitland.

The aggregate amount of excess land at these installations runs into the thousands of acres and in most cases the utilities are already available for use in a dispersal plan. By the use of Government-owned land and the erection of temporary quarters, the plan could not only be expedited but millions of dollars could be saved.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Kanfer, did you have a statement that you wanted to make?

## STATEMENT OF MORRIS KANFER, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. KANFER. I would like to make a brief statement in reply to some of the things that Mr. Reynolds stated in response to Mr. Scudder's statement.

I came in when Mr. Scudder was making the statement as to the reason why the underground facilities could not be be used. I think he asked him to make some report to this committee on the feasibility of it.

I do not recall that Mr. Reynolds has agreed to submit any report on the technical phases of it. I call your attention to the fact that at the conclusion of the testimony before the Senate subcommittee, Senator Holland similarly asked Mr. Reynolds to look into the technical phases of it. As I understand it, he has not done that either.

I really think in a democracy the majority views of the people should prevail, rather than the views of one man who happens to be in the position of blocking those views.

I am not here advocating that my property be used for underground shelters at all. I think the amendment would permit the General Services Administration to consider using similar underground space throughout the District of Columbia.

If you please, I think they could even find some suitable sites owned by the Government in the District of Columbia close to Rock Creek, where the terrain permits the construction.

If this committee does not see fit to amend this bill in a manner that I suggested, which merely gives them the authority to enter into 10-year leases, then I urge you to consider amending the bill so that you direct them to at least build some underground shelters in the District of Columbia on Government owned land, so that the people of the District will have some bomb shelters in the event of emergency.

I think the responsibility should be upon the people who are opposing this plan, in the event, God forbid, the people of the District should need bomb shelters and not have them, because the District does not have any money for the building of separate shelters.

The only possible way for the people of the District to have shelters in this atomic age is if another branch of the Government would cooperate and build such facilities, when it would cost them no more than it costs them now to lease office space in apartment houses on Massachusetts Avenue. Those facilities would be available to the District civil defense without any cost.

If there is something wrong with this proposal, let the committee say so and I will go back to my law practice and forget about it.

But in the several weeks I have discussed the subject with various officials, including the civil defense people, some of the Congressmen and Senators, each of whom have volunteered that it sounded like a good idea—to have one man, Mr. Reynolds say, "It doesn't appeal to me," and make that final I do not think is in harmony with democratic processes.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Thank you very much for your statement. This subcommittee plans to survey carefully every suggestion that has been made by everybody, and use its best judgment in the matter. We have not concluded our hearings.

As the Chair stated, we will have no hearings next week. I understand the St. Lawrence Seaway bill comes up the 20th. In the meantime, the subcommittee will sift this evidence we have had carefully and decide about suggested amendments.

When we bump up against a stump, we will call for more evidence, if we do bump into a stump. The committee is therefore adjourned until further notice.

(The following letter was subsequently submitted:)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
*February 14, 1951.*

Re opposition to H. R. 1728 and proposed dispersal of agencies within short distance of Washington.

The Honorable CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
*Chairman, House Public Works Committee,*
*House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

(Attention: Hon. James W. Trimble, subcommittee chairman.)

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express my opposition to the basic concept behind the administration's proposal to disperse upwards of 25,000 or so employees within an area of 20, 25, or even 30 miles of the Washington, D. C. metropolitan area.

It seems to me that this administration's concept is another classic instance of complete obsolete thinking of the "too little, too late, and too unimaginative variety." I have various specific objections to the proposal and they are as follows:

(1) The idea of setting up these agencies within this close-by area seems predicated on the concept that if an enemy attacks the central structure of our Government, the enemy will hit only targets in the downtown Washington area. In other words, our so-called defense planners seem to be blindly hoping that the Russians or any other enemy will plant their atomic eggs only on Seventeenth and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW. Our planners do not seem to recognize that when an intercontinental bomber flies 400 or so miles an hour and when it faces an antiaircraft barrage, the fire of interceptor planes and perhaps guided missiles, the bomber is lucky to hit within a 10, 15, or wider mile radius of its target. So the bombs destined for Seventeenth and Pennsylvania might end up by hitting the very targets that have been "dispersed." It seems to me that the more protective devices that we can ring around Washington, D. C., the greater is the likelihood that enemy bombs will indeed fall wide of their basic mark; and that means that they will hit the agencies within the 20-mile-or-so radius. Every sabotage could similarly easily paralyze transportation arteries within the 20 mile radius.

(2) A second reason why I am against this concept is that we are losing the greatest opportunity we have ever had to decentralize Federal functions out to the grassroots of America. It has always been my contention that in this high speed communication and transportation age, there is no reason why there should be as many as a quarter of a million Federal workers in Washington, D. C. That number could be drastically cut by setting up the agencies closer to the geographic centers where their particular functions actually exist. For expamle, it is quite

clear that the Department of Agriculture's various central divisions could certainly be better relocated in other areas of this nation than in Washington. I realize that there already exist, of course, field offices of these various units; but it seems to me that this program of decentralization could be greatly increased.

Of course, when I think of decentralization, I think not so much of such relative peacetime agencies as Agriculture; but basically, decentralization of the Congress, the Supreme Court, the Executive Office of the President, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the central units of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. These should be widely dispersed throughout our country, rather than distributed within an easy bomb target area of Washington.

(3) I well recognize the administrative complexities of the broad decentralization I am recommending. Obviously, if you scatter agency heads, division chiefs, and unit heads throughout the country, you are inevitably going to increase your telephone costs, teletype, transportation, etc., charges. You are going to have some delays in correspondence transmittal, etc. It seems to me, however, that even with these increased costs, the broad decentralization is infinitely preferable to the half-baked proposal which the administration has made. Under my suggestion, we will have the opportunity in scattering agencies throughout the country to split up geographically the gigantic Federal payroll, and in so doing, to pump economic life blood particularly into smaller communities.

(4) That, then, is my next point. I think that already America's major cities, like Washington, are literally choking at the center, because of the traffic jam, shortage of office space, fantastic costs of land and construction, etc. And so when I recommend that we decentralize, I don't have in mind that we merely scatter the offices to New York, Philadelphia, etc. I think that to do so is merely to move agencies from one easy bomb target to another. To the greatest extent possible, we should try to get out the agency offices to smaller sized communities of perhaps 50,000 or 100,000 population and even less. Now obviously, that again raises the question of office space, apartment space, housing, etc., just as it does in the larger communities; but I think that there is a great advantage to having agencies closer to the grass roots of this nation (with their lower costs), rather than giving them only the perspective of the major cities (with their peak costs).

I have the very highest of regard for our beautiful Nation's Capital. I can appreciate that moving some workers from here inevitably involves very serious personal problems and readjustments; but now is the time to take action; and I don't believe that the administration's ill-thought-out proposal is what we should act upon. There will still be more than enough workers in Washington, even assuming considerable decentralization; the economic life of this area will hardly be hurt.

I would deeply appreciate it if this letter could be incorporated in the printed hearings of your committee.

Thanking you, and with all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

(The following statement was subsequently submitted:)

STATEMENT BY EDMUND R. PURVES, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS RE H. R. 1728

The American Institute of Architects, the national professional society of the architectural profession, records its approbation of the foresight exercised by the Government officials and departments concerned, in proposing a dispersal of Government functions not only to relieve existing congestion but also to prepare for the very serious problems which we may have to face in the event of an attack upon this country. We recognize the essentiality of taking steps to insure the continuity of the governmental functions. The institute does not feel that it can, or that it would be appropriate for it to express an opinion on the strategic factors behind the program. However, there are definite contributions which the architects and the other planning professions can make to this program.

Although the general features of the dispersal plan seem to us sound, we agree with testimony your committee has heard that broader planning, more consultation with local officials, the consideration of housing and community facilities from the outset are desirable corollary elements in the program.

The proposed dispersal marks such an important step in governmental planning as to demand the utilization of the most expert planning talent available. We use

the phrase "planning talent" in a comprehensive sense to include all the technical professions whose services would benefit the program.

The effect of the program, not only on architecture and town planning, but also on the American political scene, will be more far reaching than perhaps has been realized. We, therefore, advocate that every opportunity be afforded the Federal Government to avail itself of expert technical service. This recommendation is made with full realization of the fine record and proven competency of the Public Buildings Service and its Commissioner. However, we feel that the importance of the program transcends the capacity of any single agency or any one profession.

There is scarcely any need to elaborate on the magnitude of the impact of the program. Testimony that the committee has heard has conveyed this. It has been the subject of articles and editorials in the public press, which have especially emphasized the corollary problems including those of housing, educational building, community planning, services and utilities and transportation.

It is inevitable that public opinion of the Government's functions and services is influenced by the aspect and plan of the buildings in which those functions and services are housed. The architectural character of the Federal buildings denotes the character of the Government. This will be especially so where Federal office buildings are located in rural areas standing out in the countryside unprotected by an urban pattern.

The prospectus of the Public Buildings Administration which has been presented to you contemplates standardized plans for an estimated six or eight buildings in different locations. The idea of standardization is not objectionable in principle, but we believe it may involve substantial waste in some cases where sites are unsuited to the standard plans or seriously impair a desirable measure of freedom in selecting sites.

With a view to defense precautions, it also appears to us that large and uniformly designed buildings standing in open country would present high-priority targets whose recognition would be a simple matter to our enemy.

To comment briefly upon the preliminary exhibits, may we observe that flexible arrangements will have a high premium, as the Public Buildings Service recognizes, but we do not believe this flexibility can be easily and efficiently obtained in buildings of huge size as those projected. A smaller unit than that now contemplated might be considered as the nucleus of the program.

An analysis of the plans exhibited indicates that the designers have been thinking in terms of routine building conditions. Further architectural possibilities should be explored.

It appears from a review of the brochure that consideration of maintenance, economy and efficiency may have been overemphasized at a sacrifice in accomplishment of the most ideal working space.

The plan, as proposed, except for the perimeter, provides interior windowless space. Although modern lighting and air conditioning are indicated, there may be psychological reactions from workers in such benighted areas. Serious personnel problems have developed in privately owned comparable office space. The question of mechanical and electrical equipment and the area required for their installations are subjects requiring not only thorough study, but the advice of leading experts in those fields.

We question the desirability and efficiency of designing a general building to serve any and all types of occupancy. A privately owned commercial building is designed to serve varying and changing occupancies. In designing buildings in the commercial field, the following are guiding principles of consideration: (*a*) Flexibility of use in the plan; (*b*) aesthetic appeal; (*c*) inviting and cheerful surroundings for executive and office workers; (*d*) efficiency in proportion of volume to square foot of building constructed or the maximum net usable area as compared to gross constructed area; (*e*) economy in initial construction; (*f*) economy in operation and maintenance.

A bold conception of how Government office buildings should be dispersed in the Washington metropolitan region demands, it seems to us, an equally bold conception of office buildings. The dispersal can be an ugly, disadvantageous and inconvenient operation and will cost the Government huge sums in extra travel and communications cost, the wasted time of employees during the working day, time wasted in commuting, which will make for recruiting difficulties of the sort we experienced in wartime all too commonly; or, it can bring a new efficiency, a heightened sense of public service, a high morale, and set an example the American people can long remember with pride.

There are numerous examples of employment subcenters designed by the Nation's best architects and erected by industry, corporations, and Government agencies. Such buildings as the General Motors Research Center, the du Pont Laboratories, the Johnson & Johnson plants, buildings in the town of Oak Ridge, office buildings of the type being erected by the New Hampshire State Highway Commission and other offices of the State Government, these offer architectural precedents for the dispersal plan.

The interest of the American Institute of Architects is centered on the development of the National Capital as a place where the Nation's aspirations are exemplified in its buildings, and where the buildings of the Government are truly expressive of the national character. The buildings of the dispersal plan will be the characteristic public buildings of our time. In their way they will be as important in the world of architecture as the Capitol and the White House were at the time they were designed; or the Interior and the Triangle buildings were in their day.

In closing we wish to add that our relationship with the Public Buildings Service has been always one of hearty cooperation. Many members of the profession have had the pleasure of working with and for the Commissioner and his staff, and in collaboration with the Public Buildings Service have assisted the advance of planning in this country. In this time of crisis there is added need for the continuance of this working pattern so happily established in the past.

(Whereupon, at 3:50 o'clock p. m., the committee adjourned.)

×